

# COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

MAY, 1945

CONTENTS

VOL. IV, NO. 4

The Study of American Art in Colleges: A Preface	ALFRED H. BARR, JR.	179
Art History and the Study of American Civilization	DONALD DREW EGBERT	182
Research in American Architecture	FRANK J. ROOS, JR.	186
American Painting Before the Civil War	FREDERICK A. SWEET	190
American Painting from the Civil War to the Present	LLOYD GOODRICH	194
The Practical Arts in American History	SIGFRIED GIEDION	198
The Need for Research in Photography	NANCY NEWHALL	203
Motion Pictures as a Field of Research	IRIS BARRY	206
European Art Collections and the War: II	GLADYS E. HAMLIN	209
Letters on the Education of Artists in Colleges	H. W. JANSON, FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR., LESTER D. LONGMAN	213
Obituaries		
Walter Curt Behrendt	HUGH S. MORRISON	221
C. Morgan Marshall	EDWARD S. KING	222
News Reports		224
Book Reviews: Max Schoen, editor, <i>The Enjoyment of the Arts</i> (CARL THURSTON); Erle Loran, <i>Cézanne's Composition: Analysis of His Form with Diagrams and Photographs of His Motifs</i> (DOUGLAS MACAGY); Paul Klee, <i>Pedagogical Sketch Book</i> ; Will Grohmann, <i>The Drawings of Paul Klee</i> (H. W. JANSON); <i>Velásquez, Complete Edition</i> (OSKAR HAGEN); Museum of Modern Art, <i>Lyonel Feininger</i> ; Marsden Hartley (JOHN FABIAN KIENITZ); Darrell Garwood, <i>Artist in Iowa: A Life of Grant Wood</i> (FRANK J. ROOS, JR.); Naito Toichiro, <i>The Wall Paintings of Horyuji</i> (LANGDON WARNER)		228
Books Received		244
Index for Volume IV		246

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

ALFRED H. BARR, JR., who is special advisory editor for this issue, is the Director of Research in Painting and Sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art and Chairman of the CAA Committee on the History of American Art.

DONALD DREW EGBERT is Associate Professor of Architecture at Princeton University. Author of *The Tickhill Psalter and Related Manuscripts* (1940), which was awarded the Haskins Medal of the Mediaeval Academy of America, and co-author of *Foreign Influences in American Life* (1944), he has recently been active in developing the Program of Study in American Civilization at Princeton.

FRANK J. ROOS, JR., is on the staff of the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Ohio State University and author of articles and a recent bibliography on American architecture. He is Secretary-Treasurer of the American Society of Architectural Historians.

FREDERICK A. SWEET is Associate Curator of Painting and Sculpture at the Art Institute of Chicago. He assembled and catalogued the current exhibition "The Hudson River School and the Early American Landscape Tradition."

LLOYD GOODRICH is Research Curator of the Whitney Museum of American Art and Director of the American Art Research Council. Author of books on Eakins and Homer, he is arranging a special issue of *Art in America* on research in American art to appear next fall.

SIGFRIED GIEDION, the eminent critic of modern architecture, held the Charles Eliot Norton chair at Harvard in 1939 and later lectured at Yale. Author of *Space, Time, and Architecture* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 5th Printing, 1945) he is now at work on a book dealing with the impact of mechanization on habits, art and environment.

NANCY NEWHALL is Acting Curator of Photography at the Museum of Modern Art and wife of Major Beaumont Newhall. Author of several articles on photography, she is writing a book on the creative development of photography.

IRIS BARRY, Curator of the Museum of Modern Art Film Library, was founder of the Film Society, London, film critic of *The Spectator* and the *Daily Mail* and is the author or editor of several books on the motion picture.

GLADYS E. HAMLIN is a Research Assistant in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, Washington, D.C.

## THE STUDY OF AMERICAN ART IN COLLEGES: A PREFACE

BY ALFRED H. BARR, JR.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—*Mr. Barr has served as advisory editor for this issue and we wish to acknowledge his valuable advice and assistance.*

THIS number of the COLLEGE ART JOURNAL is propaganda. It is intended to persuade the scholars in American universities—undergraduates, graduate students, instructors, professors—to interest themselves more deeply in studying the history of the arts in the United States.

University scholars with a few important exceptions seem to have overlooked research in American Art. Since 1918 the *Art Bulletin* has published about 150 articles on Early Christian and Medieval art, 165 on the Renaissance and Modern art of Europe but only seven really scholarly articles in the American field—and of these, six were on architecture, only one on painting.

Different reasons are advanced for this curious though, I am sure, temporary state of affairs. Members of the College Art Association have explained, variously, that American art is too near both in time and in space to afford proper perspective for serious study, that is, American art is too modern or too far removed from the heart of the great classic periods; it does not provide an adequate discipline for students because it does not involve the mastery of foreign languages; the source material is too chaotic and diffuse, there is too much of it for the student to sift or too little of it in dependable and accessible form. Some felt that very few university professors were equipped either to do research in American art themselves or to guide the student who wished to enter the field; one said that research in American art would be too expensive because the field was new and unsubsidized; another, that graduate students concentrating on American art might find themselves handicapped in their professional careers. One professor asked half seriously whether after all there was any American art worth studying.

Such arguments might seem discouraging were it not for the fact that they are already countered by changing minds and by the pressure of events both practical and cultural. The tide has turned.

The undergraduate courses in American art have increased fourfold in the last ten years. Popular and scholarly interest in the American past has grown on many levels, in many directions, and in various institutions, including, significantly, university departments of literature, political history, and economics. Faculty committees, deans, presidents, and trustees of universities are studying new plans for comprehensive interdepartmental courses in "American civilization" or in one instance a curriculum in "American Studies" conducted by six cooperating departments. Possibly these plans have been influenced by the "area" courses given interdepartmentally at universities under the Army Specialized Training Programs to prepare officers *culturally* for posts in the military government of occupied countries as diverse as Germany and Formosa. "Area" training in the culture of the United States may well be wanted—in both senses of the word—by soldiers back from the wars as well as by younger students.

There can be little doubt that university departments of art history will meet the challenge which is already confronting them. Some departments are actively preparing themselves, a few are already prepared. Representatives from these departments have in fact been formed by the president of the College Art Association into a Committee on the History of American Art. The Committee has met and has made a report to the Board of Directors which received it favorably and recommended that it be published after careful review by the Executive Committee. It appears here in the present issue of the JOURNAL.

The Executive Committee also approved the suggestion made by the Editor of the JOURNAL that the current issue be devoted to a series of articles on the arts in America as subjects for university research. Following the Executive Committee's recommendation the "arts" proposed for study include not only American painting, sculpture, graphic arts and architecture—the last already a serious concern of university scholars—but also the arts of the film, photography, and industrial design. The authors of most of the following essays—in painting for instance as well as in less orthodox fields—are museum scholars. They have all written with a desire to arouse interest; they offer such help as they can give; but more than this, they ask help from the colleges. There is so much to be done and it is vitally important to do it well, and soon.

At the same time all are aware of certain dangers. The bandwagon of chauvinism, of America First art history, can be heard



braying on a side road. It must be kept off the highway. This can best be done by scholars with a broad knowledge and a thorough training such as our best graduate schools provide, scholars who will study, publish and teach the history of the arts in the United States with enthusiasm but also with an understanding of their relation to American civilization as a whole, to the culture of other countries and continents and to the great historical traditions. In this way the knowledge and love of our own art may take its proper place within the structure of world civilization, past and future.<sup>1</sup>

*The Museum of Modern Art*  
*New York City*

<sup>1</sup> Readers are referred to the following articles relevant to the study of American art which have appeared in previous issues of the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL*: Robert J. Goldwater's article, "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the United States" (C.A.J. II, 4, Supplement), gives striking evidence of the increase in the comparative number of undergraduate courses in the history of American art. Beaumont Newhall's "Photography as a Branch of Art History" (C.A.J. I, 4) serves as a background to Mrs. Newhall's article in the current issue. The general problem of college teaching and research in modern art of which most American art is a part was broached in "Modern Art Makes History, Too" by A. H. Barr, Jr. (C.A.J. I, 1) and was thereafter debated by Frank Jewett Mather, Jr. in "Old Art or New" (C.A.J. I, 2), by Laurence Schmeckebier in "Modern Art First, Not Last" (C.A.J. I, 3), by James Thrall Soby in "In Defense of Modern Art as a Field of Research" (C.A.J. I, 3), and by Robert J. Goldwater in "Modern Art in the College Curriculum" (C.A.J. I, 4). The value of both scholarly training in art history and of an international breadth of view when appraising American art is demonstrated in "The Great Moderns—A Reappraisal" by Samuel Cauman (C.A.J. II, 4), in "The International Aspects of Regionalism" by H. W. Janson (C.A.J. II, 4) and in Milton W. Brown's review of Jerome Mellquist's "The Emergence of an American Art" (C.A.J. II, 1). A method of studying local American architecture is illustrated in Laurence Schmeckebier's "Art on Main Street" (C.A.J. III, 3).

Some of the points in the above preface are presented at greater length in "The American Art Research Council and the Colleges" by A. H. Barr, Jr. (C.A.J. IV, 1). Lloyd Goodrich, Director of the Council which has done so much to stimulate research in American painting, is serving as guest editor for a special issue of *Art in America* which will appear in the fall and will be devoted to various aspects of the historical study of American art.

## ART HISTORY AND THE STUDY OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

BY DONALD DREW EGBERT

AS EVERYONE knows, an increasing number of American colleges and universities are displaying a new and vigorous interest in American civilization as a field of study. The growth and extent of this interest are indicated not only by the large number of college courses being established in the American field, but also by the numerous conferences, regional and national, held of late to consider its possibilities. It is evident that programs for investigating American culture as a whole will play an important part in many post-war curricula. And this raises questions not only regarding the form programs of this sort should take but of the role which the history of art can play in them. In relatively few of those already founded has the history of art been included, yet first-hand experience shows that by their very nature the arts offer one of the most versatile and useful media for the study of American civilization.

The form which programs devoted to that study should be given depends, of course, on the ends desired; and perhaps the nature of those ends can best be determined in the light of the chief reasons for the new interest in American culture. Certainly one reason for such interest is the desire to consider and reappraise various time-honored American traditions—American rugged individualism, for example—at a time when those traditions have been under severe attack. Furthermore, the growing reaction against the elective system in American education, at least in its extreme “cafeteria” form, accounts for the desire to amend it by means of carefully integrated programs of study, of which those in American civilization are but one kind.

Although American civilization is only one of the many possible subjects for an integrated program of this sort, it has certain initial advantages. In the first place it has the tremendous advantage of being a field with which the student is already acquainted at first hand simply because he is an American, so that work can begin at a less elementary level. Furthermore, it is a subject which, better than most, can be related to all the major divisions of learning, including

the humanities, social studies, and sciences; hence it has particular appeal today as a means for overcoming the dangers of complete specialization within a limited department of study. Not only can it take into account the subject matter of the chief divisions of learning, but to it can also be applied such different methods of approach as the chronological and evolutionary method of the historian, the systematic method of the philosopher, the peculiarly personal approach of the artist, and the more purely objective or pragmatic approach of the scientist and technologist.

Obviously an integrated course of study in which American civilization is investigated from all these different points of view cannot be adequately supervised by a single scholar or teacher. It can be achieved only by the close cooperation of specialists in different fields, specialists with sufficient breadth of interest to wish to relate the methods and special contributions of other fields to their own. Such individuals are not always easy to find, and even when found, adequate cooperation between them is difficult to accomplish. It is probably safe to say that an integrated program of American studies can never be achieved—as so many institutions are seeking to achieve it—merely by requiring students to elect courses from those already being given on American subjects. Special and more cooperative teaching and research must be added in which the members of the faculty in charge of the program work closely together, and which also cut across major fields of study to connect a wide range of departments. Only in this way can different specialists acquaint themselves adequately with the methods and implications of other fields. Only in this way can they become acquainted with the now highly specialized terminology of studies other than their own, terminology in which very different meanings are often attached to the same word in different fields.

The difficulties of cooperative teaching and research, even under the best conditions, are such as to require much more faculty time and energy than in ordinary teaching. Hence to make any program of integrated study work satisfactorily, the college or university authorities must be prepared to give extra time allowance to the faculty participants. Usually, too, it is only among the younger members of a faculty that teachers can be found with the enthusiasm and energy necessary to acquaint themselves sufficiently with other fields of learning. Yet it is the younger faculty members who for lack of tenure in their departments are most likely to be forced to drop out and thereby disrupt the committee in charge. In short,

although a high degree of continuity in this supervising committee is absolutely imperative, it is one of the things most difficult to obtain.

The specific form that cooperative teaching and research in American civilization should take necessarily varies from college to college depending upon such things as the numbers of students participating, as well as on the financial and human resources available in a given institution. In the Princeton Program of Study in American Civilization, the one this author knows at first hand, the method found most successful has been as follows.

As a prerequisite for the Program (which begins with junior year) students must acquire a general knowledge of some period of European civilization to provide contrast and background to the study of American civilization. Upon enrolling, the student is also required to major in a specific department, choosing in this case one of the six departments cooperating in the Program—namely, Art, Economics, English, History, Philosophy, and Politics. Thus far none of the natural sciences has been included primarily because of the difficulty of finding scientists with the necessary range of interests, particularly in wartime.

By requiring a student to be enrolled in a specific department as well as in the Program the benefits of specialization are retained, yet through investigation of American culture in general the student's special field is related to other important fields. With this in view, the student is further required to take at least four courses in American subjects chosen from a carefully restricted list and representing four different approaches: the historical, the philosophical, the artistic or literary, and the institutional.

The focus of the American Program at Princeton, however, is a kind of seminar for seniors and faculty members, conducted with the help of outside experts when necessary. The subject of the seminar is changed annually, and the kind of subject found most effective is one which, while relevant to all cooperating fields, is at the same time relatively restricted in scope. By way of example, two subjects that have proved particularly successful may be cited: Socialism in American Life from Colonial Times to the Present, and The Doctrine of Evolution in American Life. It has also been found that, by publishing in book form the chief papers delivered before the seminar as well as the bibliographies prepared in connection with it, not only can various major gaps in American studies be filled, but the cooperating specialists are made much more aware of the success or deficiencies of their collaboration.



So much for the characteristics of one typical and at least reasonably successful program of study in American civilization. In the light of what has been said, what is the specific place of the history of the fine and applied arts in such a program? Like other major fields of learning this too has its own particular contributions to make. In the first place, the history of art can play a most important part simply because the very nature of the subject itself involves all major divisions of learning. For not only can art be taught as one of the humanities, but works of art are social and historical documents, and at the same time involve—especially in the case of architecture—significant scientific and technological problems. Correspondingly, the arts themselves can be approached with profit in various ways: not only from the point of view of the artist as creator, or from that of chronological development, but systematically, or from a pragmatic point of view as well. In order to take best advantage of all these possibilities, it is advisable to teach the history of several related arts together, rather than any one of them alone, since advantage can then be taken of the fact that several related disciplines are being dealt with. In other words, methods of integration and coordination can then be directly illustrated within the arts themselves. After that, it is relatively easy to show the student how to cross the wider gaps between the various humanistic studies, and the still wider gaps between the humanities, the sciences, and the social studies. The art historian, in short, by the very nature of his subject is better prepared than most other specialists for bringing different disciplines together into an integrated whole.

But this is not the only advantage which the history of the arts has over other subjects in studying a single civilization. Unlike many subjects art history requires considerations of values implicit both in the individual and in society. Unlike the natural and sometimes the social scientist, whose methods must discount questions of value in advance, the art historian can forget the worth of the individual artist only with peril. At the same time, the art historian is forced to consider the relation of the individual to society, particularly if he includes the art of architecture which by its very nature is a cooperative and hence social art.

A further major advantage which the history of the arts of design has over that of other arts and other fields of study, is the greater amount of ground which can be covered in a given period of time. As any teacher of art history knows, the visual arts—especially when taught through the medium of photographic illus-



tration—can acquaint the student with a much larger number of important works in a given time than is possible in other subjects. This is especially valuable in a program involving more than one field of study, in which, therefore, time is at a premium.

Finally, art history is important for a program of American studies in particular, as a safeguard against provincialism and chauvinism, the dangers to which programs of study in American culture are most likely to succumb. It is for this reason that the teacher of American art should be trained in the whole history of art. For in proportion as his knowledge of the arts is historically and geographically ramified, the historian of art is not so likely as the teachers of subjects more restricted in temporal or geographical scope to treat American civilization as if it existed entirely independent of outside influences, or for that matter, as if it were entirely subservient to foreign traditions. In short, he will relate American art to contemporary currents elsewhere without succumbing either to that kind of provincialism which is suspicious of anything foreign, or to the other provincialism which results from slavishly praising and aping the last foreign mode, the latest foreign fad.

*Princeton University*

## RESEARCH IN AMERICAN ARCHITECTURE

BY FRANK J. ROOS, JR.

**M**AKING an extensive bibliography is normally unexciting and often tedious, but it does have compensations. When it is completed one has a perspective on the scholarship in the field such as could not be achieved as readily in any other way. It is possible to identify the details that have been well covered, those that have been partly covered, and, more important, those that have been entirely neglected.

The following observations on the status of research in American architecture is in part the result of a bibliographic task completed two years ago.<sup>1</sup> Much work has been done on the subject, of course, but much still needs doing. Until comparatively recently the number of sound and comprehensive studies in the field were rather few. The subject was early in the hands of the antiquarians, who

<sup>1</sup> Frank J. Roos, Jr., *Writings on Early American Architecture*, Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1943.

wrote glowingly of all old buildings. The architects, even though they made careful measured drawing of the old structures, often did not attempt to organize the material which they were studying. For one thing, there was not enough material collected for a true interpretation of types and trends.

The architectural historian now has available, however, enough information to pursue the task with a greater chance of success. Many college art departments have started courses in American art and architecture within the last decade, and some of them have been training scholars in these specific fields. The result may be seen in the fact that the year 1938 saw four doctoral dissertations on American architecture. Art historians, with sound training, who previously had been interested in European art, finding Europe closed to them, had turned to the most available raw material for their labors. Even a number of scholars from Europe have found rich material here with which to work. As further proof of this rising interest in the subject, the last decade has seen the organization of a number of important bodies of source material which will greatly help students. One of these is the invaluable Historic American Buildings Survey. The founding of the American Society of Architectural Historians is but another evidence of an increased interest in the subject, along with the more traditional studies. College art libraries have, in recent years, been buying more extensively in the American architectural field, as is proved by the rising cost of the 19th century builders' handbooks, which contain so much for the student.

Thus, with an increased interest in the subject and more materials than previously available, we may expect more results and a higher quality of production. We need more and larger collections of photographs of buildings, taken by the historians themselves rather than by professional photographers, who do not always know what photographs are most useful. We need telephoto pictures of details of buildings, which often tell more of the psychology and stylistic attitude of the builders than illustrations of the entire buildings. Even a cursory examination of the handbooks suggests that it was the details and the proportions that made a building good, at least up to the time of the Romantic revival. Further examination of these sources may even force us to change our attitude toward what constituted good or bad architecture for those times.

We need more studies of individual buildings from all localities. Many buildings as good as those already published are unrecorded. Some structures already published should be revisited, since their

earlier chroniclers had neither training, nor access to the records for documentation. Geographic studies of architecture by state or region have been common since the first one was published on Virginia in 1853. Charleston, Portsmouth, Salem and the Vieux Carrée in New Orleans are typical of the cities that have been covered extensively because they are comparatively intact and therefore tempting. But there are many small towns, particularly east of the Mississippi, that would yield much profit. Central and upper New York state have many good buildings that have not been studied. The early Dutch architecture of the mid-Atlantic states and the work of the Pennsylvania Germans need much attention. New Jersey has unrecorded material, as do Mississippi, West Virginia and the western counties of Virginia. Of the mid-western states, Ohio is so far the best covered, but Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri and Wisconsin all have material enough for books on the subject. These will be easier to do because of the existence of the Federal Writers' Project State Guides which, although full of errors, are very useful.

Wanted, also, are further studies of styles, types and details. The Greek and Roman revivals have been given some attention of late, but there is still much that will tell us more about these important influences in our early artistic history. The Romantic revival is practically untouched throughout the country, although the groundwork has been laid in a few books and articles. Architectural historians, like the antiquarians, tend to be interested in objects a hundred or more years old, and the Romantic revival might be said, on this basis, to have come of age. Even though the taste of the last several generations has professed to see little good in the Romantic revival we can no more afford to ignore it than we can ignore the influence of our own grandparents on our lives. The approach to the works of the Romanticists must be different, psychologically speaking, from the approach to the preceding styles, but the results can be as profitable as in any other period.

There are many types of buildings practically untouched by the historians. The development of the apartment house and communal living is not as well understood in America as it should be, and the Mid-west and East are full of comparatively unknown immigrant and military types, windmills, lighthouses and shot towers. Little is known of the variations of the log cabin form, which are particularly profitable to study, since in them we can see native ingenuity at work, often uninfluenced by architectural training. The balloon

frame and the development of cast iron as a structural material have received some attention of late, but much more must be done with them. We know little of the foundries and their mould designs. Wrought iron, as an architectural feature, has been practically ignored. We need too, a closer study and codification of original details of existing buildings, such as bricks, bond, moulding profiles, muntin details and hardware. Our architectural histories speak extensively of the style of the shell and façade, and usually ignore the development of the sanitation and heating facilities that affected the life of the occupants even more than the style. A greater knowledge of such details as these will help us to a better understanding of the relationship between architecture and living, and make restoration and dating more accurate. The use of color in architecture, before and after the Classic revival, was more important than the published writings so far would lead us to believe, and exposition architecture and its influence is not too well understood. The Spanish influence in the South-east and the West has not yet been sufficiently surveyed.

Many architects, such as Samuel Rhoads of Philadelphia, William Buckland of Annapolis and Asher Benjamin of Boston, whose contributions to our architectural history were important, have been so far comparatively overlooked. The latter, with Minard Lafever, may well prove, eventually, to have had more influence on American architecture generally than Benjamin Latrobe, who himself should be studied further. Many of Latrobe's followers, for example, William Strickland, still need attention. Bulfinch could be revisited, since practically nothing has been written on him in the last twenty years. Samuel Blodget, George Hadfield, Stephen Hallet, Peter Harrison, David Hoadley, James Hoban and others, with varying degrees of experience, training and importance, have been neglected. Some of the architects who worked in the Mid-west and the South, such as Francis Costigan, John Francis Rague and James Gallier deserve more attention than they have had. Everyone admits the importance of the Romantics, A. J. Downing, Samuel Sloan and James Renwick, but no one has done anything to speak of about them. Orson Squire Fowler, an undoubted precursor of Buckminster Fuller, may eventually prove to be the inspiration for most of the octagonal buildings scattered throughout the country, and the interior architecture of the Mississippi packets may turn out to be the highest flowering of the Romantic revival. Someone should sort out the various influences in the Battle of the Styles. The Italian villas and Swiss chalets have a sociological significance of which we now understand

very little. And we should get together on our period and stylistic terminology.

Antiquarians have recorded much that is useful, but students must now sort and organize this material for more practical use. The printed records of the various state and local historical societies and the art museum bulletins all offer profit, as do newspaper files. We need from such documents itemized bills and contracts for building. They can be checked against lists of time to be spent on house details by the carpenter, as published in some of the builders' handbooks. Through such studies we can learn more about the builder and his work, his economic life and his day.

When more of these various subjects have been covered we shall have reached a higher degree in the science of Preservationism which was well developed in Europe and which, seemingly, we must now carry on. And finally we would do well to try to understand ourselves and our past by a more careful investigation of the non-derivative and peculiarly American architectural forms. Certain of our indigenous plant forms used decoratively, the serpentine wall, our city and town plans, our pre-skyscraper building methods and patented conveniences, when better understood will help clarify our present as well as our future.

*Ohio State University*

## AMERICAN PAINTING BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

BY FREDERICK A. SWEET

THE period from 1800 to the Civil War was one of the most significant eras in the political and geographical expansion of the United States, and it was equally important for the nation's cultural development. In painting the production was enormous and varied. Large numbers of European painters migrated to the new land, but even more native sons achieved success as artists. In addition to the established taste for portraits, the interest in genre painting and landscape increased. Opportunities for intelligent research and interpretation of this period are endless. It is gratifying to know that certain work is in progress and the recent publications are welcome. Bartlett Cowdrey and Hermann Warner Williams, Jr., col-



labored on a book covering the landscapes and genre paintings of William Sidney Mount. Edgar P. Richardson's *American Romantic Painting* combines a thoughtful text with an excellent group of illustrations. His forthcoming book on Washington Allston is eagerly awaited as we also look forward to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana's book on Allston. As the most significant figure in American painting at the opening of the nineteenth century, Allston needs careful study.

Alan Burroughs is working on Alvin Fisher, a New England painter of unusual interest, and E. M. Bloch is making a study of George Caleb Bingham which will undoubtedly bring further light on this important Missouri painter who has already been the subject of an interesting biography by Albert Christ-Janer. Parker Leslie has made great strides towards a much-needed book on Thomas Cole which will have to await the end of the war for completion. *The American Leonardo* by Carleton Mabree is a comprehensive account of Samuel F. B. Morse as a man, but has little critical material on his work. Harry B. Wehle is also an authority on Morse and published an excellent catalogue in 1932 for the Morse exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum. Virgil Barker is making a survey of painting in the South. Howard N. Doughty has made an excellent start in his manuscript dealing with his great-granduncle, Thomas Doughty, who was so important as one of the founders of the Hudson River School. This work should be continued, as a scholarly monograph on Doughty would be of the greatest value in our understanding of nineteenth century landscape. Except for the biography published by his son fifty years ago, nothing of importance has been done on Asher B. Durand. There is equally great need for a sound chronology and critical estimate of his work. The same could be said of dozens of other painters of this time.

With the revival of interest in the painters of the early and mid-nineteenth century, more and more pictures of the period are coming to light, but there are still vast numbers hidden away which need to be located in order that we may have a more complete understanding of the many artists who were active then. This material must be coordinated with all available records. Exhibition catalogues covering the major portion of the pre-Civil War period were issued by the Boston Athenaeum, the National Academy, the Pennsylvania Academy, as well as by numerous smaller organizations. The published proceedings of these groups contain much valuable information. Another important source is the records of

the American Art Union which was such a prominent factor in distributing American art from 1839 to 1852.

A wealth of material in the form of documents, sketchbooks, diaries, account books, etc., is still in the hands of descendants of numerous artists or else has been given to libraries and historical societies. Contemporary accounts in periodicals and the local press, town records and wills, must all be searched in order to reach every possible source of information.

Landscape painters, portrait painters, genre painters, historical painters, should all be given due consideration. They must not only be critically studied as individuals, but must be estimated in relation to each other and to the writers, poets, architects, and even the naturalists and scientists of the period in order that a true judgment may be made of this phase of our cultural development. There was a great deal of interchange between these various groups—Washington Irving made sketches, almost gave up writing to become a painter because of his admiration for Allston; both Robert Fulton and Samuel F. B. Morse are equally famed as painters and inventors; Thomas Cole wrote poetry, was a devoted friend of William Cullen Bryant who delivered Cole's funeral oration; James Audubon and Alexander Wilson were both artists and serious students of nature; William Dunlap combined painting with theatrical management, as well as writing in 1834 the first critical account of American artists and their work.

Artists are closely bound up with western expansion: George Catlin and Alfred Miller were exploring the uncharted West as early as the 1830's, John Mix Stanley in the forties, and many other artists in the years which followed. Bernard de Voto is publishing a book on Alfred Miller and his famous trip with William Drummond Stewart in 1837; Macgill James has also made a study of this artist. Much more research, however, needs to be done on these artists and such a source as the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library in Chicago should be systematically culled in this connection.

Many artists such as Wall and Havell were primarily concerned with doing paintings from which engravings and colored lithographs were made. This relationship with the prints of the period is in itself a field needing careful investigation. Town views, scenic views, notable events were depicted by artists and published in vast numbers. Similar subjects were used as decorations on Staffordshire china and the output of other ceramic factories. A complete study of Thomas Cole would then lead one from paintings into the field of prints and chinaware. Furthermore the question must be carefully

studied as to the nature and extent of European influences on our painters. To what extent did they see in this country prints and drawings, and an occasional painting by European masters? What engravings after European paintings were circulated here? Then, on going to Europe, what did our painters derive from the English school, what did they absorb in France and Italy, and what was their connection with the contemporary romantic painters of Germany? Since they met artists from many countries in Rome, an important research problem revolves around the contacts which arose in this city alone. Rome, in fact, may hold the key as to just how much influence the German school really did exert and how deeply the seventeenth century Italian school affected American painting. Madame de Staël, the von Humboldt brothers, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and many other important personages not artists themselves have had bearing on the cultural life of nineteenth century Rome.

A whole field of research is open to those who will trace the literary, philosophical, and religious influences which came to bear on our painters. It was an age when various protestant cults were strong, English romantic literature was much read in this country, and nature philosophy received its American interpretation by Emerson and Thoreau. Our painters were strongly influenced by the current thought of their day and the effect on their work would be a matter of great interest.

Though the questions of where and when the paintings were done, what meaning they had, and what influences came to bear on the artists are all very important, the problem of aesthetics must also be carefully studied. Just how good were they as painters, how well did they interpret their own age, and how do they compare with their European contemporaries? Our estimate of these men must be positive. We must not base our judgment solely on comparisons with, nor in terms of, twentieth century canons of taste. America's romantic age was composed of many trends and many modes of expression, but there was an underlying spirit which gave it consistency. Edgar P. Richardson has made an excellent start in defining the meaning of our art of this period, but a great deal more needs to be said on the subject.

Henry Tuckerman in his *American Artist Life*, published in 1870, emphasizes many artists who are scarcely known to us today. Perhaps his estimate is more accurate than our own; in any case his opinions bear investigation.

Finally the early collectors should be the subject of a book since

we can in that way obtain a clear idea of the taste of the period. This is a vast field in itself, but certain men could be emphasized to advantage. Robert Gilmore of Baltimore, Stephen Salisbury II, of Worcester, and several New Yorkers, notably Samuel Ward, Jonathan Sturges, and Luman Reed, are but a few of those whose collections should be investigated.

Let us hope that scholars will take up research to a greatly increased degree in early nineteenth century American art. The field is wide open.

*The Art Institute of Chicago*

## AMERICAN PAINTING FROM THE CIVIL WAR TO THE PRESENT

BY LLOYD GOODRICH

THE eighty years since the Civil War have been those of America's greatest artistic activity. The nation's phenomenal material growth created the wealth and leisure necessary for widespread appreciation and practice of the arts. With increasing foreign contacts, the early provincialism began to disappear. The period witnessed the greatest growth in museums, collections, exhibitions and art education that had taken place in any country or age. Creatively, it was ushered in by a generation of strongly individual artists—Whistler, Inness, La Farge, Homer, Eakins, Ryder, Saint-Gaudens, Sargent. Responsiveness to foreign movements increased, and American art moved more and more into the main stream of world art; while at the same time there were more outstanding examples of native independence. With each decade public interest in our art increased, until today, judging by the number and attendance of exhibitions of American art, and the amount of space devoted to it in magazines and newspapers, it is the most active artistic interest of the American people. Without chauvinism, one can say that it has taken its place among the four or five most important national schools of today.

But until recently, critical study of this vital period has lagged far behind its achievements. In proportion to the number of its outstanding artists it has been much less explored than the Colonial era. In spite of a vast mass of current journalistic reporting, few of



its artists have been given the kind of scholarly study that has been devoted to Europeans of the same epoch and relative position in their own countries. The books on our artists have usually been personal biographies rather than genuinely critical studies, and few of even the most important figures have been catalogued. The relation of artists to their environment, the regional factors, the complex cross-currents of foreign influences and native trends, the contribution of the government art programs—none of these have yet been adequately analyzed. Compared to the thorough study that historians have devoted to the political, economic and social history of the period, our art historians have barely scratched the surface. Of late years, however, more researchers have begun working in the field, chiefly in studies of individual artists. Most of these students have been in museums or unaffiliated. The American Art Research Council has devoted itself especially to recording the works of leading figures of the time. The colleges have so far done comparatively little research in the period, although there are signs of awakening interest on the part of students and some teachers.

The incentives to research in the period are great. First and most obviously, it is the art of our own time and place, with all the immediacy and meaningfulness that this involves. Whatever our critical judgment of it, it is something we must understand if we are to play a part in the creative processes of the world in which we live. And it offers unique opportunities for original research. After decades of intensive study of the past, the law of diminishing returns is beginning to make itself felt as concerns subjects for original research. But in recent American art it is still possible to select major figures, schools and tendencies that have never been thoroughly studied.

Until recently it was customary for college art departments to look askance at modern art as a field for research and teaching, because of the lack of any long perspective on it and hence of any fixed criteria. This viewpoint was based on two debatable hypotheses—that our judgment of the past is immutable and "right," while our judgment of the present is subject to change and therefore "wrong." Actually our judgment of the past does change, as is obvious to any student of the history of taste; while contemporary judgment, though by its nature it is often "wrong," is also quite frequently "right." Of the post-Civil-War generation, for example, all the artists now considered important were so considered by their contemporaries, except Eakins and Ryder, and even they were recog-



nized in old age. Enlightened contemporary taste frequently anticipates the judgment of the future with remarkable accuracy. When it errs, it is more often on the side of over-tolerance and inclusiveness than of neglect. From the educational standpoint, even its relative mutability has definite advantages. The very fact that values are not fixed for all time develops the student's capacity for independent judgment.

Work in the recent American field can also foster the student's ability to use all kinds of source material. The sources are far more varied and extensive than in earlier periods. Up to the end of the Civil War there were few museums or exhibitions. The few art books and magazines paid little attention to American art and were meagerly illustrated. But beginning in the 1870's came a vast increase in museums, in exhibitions and auction sales of American art, in dealers who handled it and in collectors who bought it. There were many more art magazines and books, devoting greater space to native art and more fully illustrated as photo-mechanical processes replaced wood-engraving. The camera began to record works of art with a new accuracy. All of this has created an *embarras de richesses* for the student. The problem is no longer, as in the colonial field, to find original sources, but to digest the vast mass of them that is available.

The nearer we come to our own time, the more direct is our contact with the artist himself. Even if he is no longer living, his family, friends or pupils will be, and his letters and notes will survive. His dealers will have records of sales, and his works will often be in the hands of their original purchasers. All of this makes for a kind of first-hand documentation seldom found in earlier periods. It also develops the student's resourcefulness and imagination, and helps counteract the too frequent tendency to rely on books rather than on eyes and ears. Colleges in the past have been reluctant to sanction advanced research in fields where there is not yet much published source material. This seems a good deal like putting the cart before the horse. It is fortunate for our knowledge of the masters of the Italian Renaissance that Vasari did not have to submit to the requirements of the average doctoral dissertation.

It is not generally realized that problems of authenticity occur as frequently in recent American art as in earlier periods. Most of the leading figures have been extensively forged. As soon as an artist of any prominence dies (and sometimes before) the forgeries begin to appear. Already men as recent as Bellows and Eilshemius have re-

ceived this posthumous honor. Even a painter as skillful and full of character as Homer has been widely faked; the writer has records of several hundred examples. Often these pictures are by minor contemporaries, with false signatures and manufactured pedigrees, and their detection is easy. But in extreme cases like Ryder and Blakelock the forgeries are deliberate, sometimes dating back to the artist's lifetime; and they may outnumber the genuine pictures by as much as ten to one, so that the artist's real character has been practically lost sight of, and any study of his work involves stylistic judgment of the most exacting kind. Fortunately, even in these extreme cases, there is enough contemporary documentation to establish a body of unquestionably genuine works, by comparison with which the undocumented pictures may be judged. In many cases scientific examination with x-ray and microscope is necessary, to build up the data as to the artist's technical methods on which to base stylistic judgment. Much work in examination and attribution needs to be done before the situation as to authenticity in this period can be cleared up.

Problems of attribution are so fascinating (a sort of artistic detective work) that there is danger of forgetting that they are after all a poor substitute for actual knowledge, and that to do away with future doubt as to authorship is both desirable and possible. In attaining this objective, the recording of the works of leading artists of the present and the recent past, now being carried on by the American Art Research Council, should be of great importance. It suggests a future when the energy of our scholars will no longer be dissipated in intriguing problems of "who done it," but can be devoted to the more important matter of the intrinsic quality and meaning of the work of art.

*Whitney Museum of American Art*  
*New York City*

## THE PRACTICAL ARTS IN AMERICAN HISTORY

BY SIGFRIED GIEDION

EVERYBODY knows that during the past twenty years art history has been caught up in the throes of a severe crisis. The place that history is granted in life changes with the times and with the attitude toward the past. In the nineteenth century, with the eagerness to explore diverse periods, history came to the fore and found its acknowledged place. In art, architecture, and sculpture, the practitioners of ruling taste—we mean the taste of officials, governments, and the masses—used this historical knowledge for their own purposes: they pilfered history. In our century the situation is somewhat changed. Painting and sculpture can make little use of historical reminiscence. Only in furniture and official architecture do nineteenth century habits still linger on. But here, too, history has fulfilled its pragmatic purpose and lies readily available on the shelves, like tabulations of tensile strength.

The crisis stems from the fact that in the last few decades artists have succeeded in creating the tools by which to grasp the new reality, reality in the shaping; while historians have not succeeded in creating equivalent historical tools and methods that might fit their research into the broader pattern of life. This situation is widely felt, especially by students, that is, by young people entering upon their careers, and faced with decisions concerning the future. Not long ago some students of art history asked me: "Do you think that the faculty can be reformed or should it be blown up as a whole?"

This may seem a radical attitude; but behind it lies a moral question: Are we doing the right thing? Have we not lost contact with reality?

To avoid misunderstanding let us say that contact with reality does not merely mean studying contemporary history or the immediately preceding period. It means that we should gain knowledge of all periods—Minoan, Roman, Gothic, as well as primitive cultures—through the studies of scholars who have developed a capacity equivalent to that of the artist: the artist masters reality by selecting its relevant fragments and shaping them to our emotional needs. Any period is an immense reality out of which we may seek objects,

trends, and problems meaningful to us today, and each new period must strive to interpret the past according to its own needs.

Far be it from us to underrate disinterested research, research for non-pragmatic purposes. But we know that specialistic research lacking contact with contemporary reality quickly leads to the ivory tower, and it is fear of the ivory tower that makes youth feel uneasy. As our civilization shows by the crisis in every field, purely specialized research has become not only archaic, but dangerous.

It is still possible of course to treat the art and architecture of nineteenth century ruling taste according to the purely stylistic methods adequate to the study of earlier periods. But in the case of the nineteenth century this can do no more than scratch the surface. Styles, like symbols, became devaluated in the nineteenth century, so that, for instance, pursuit of the rococo revivals, thrice recurrent in the course of the century, will lead nowhere. It is not the period that matters, but the approach and the methodological control. For it is possible, on the other hand, to explore prehistoric cultures in such a way as to obtain insight into questions whose answers have been forgotten.

Another circumstance may underly the attitude of the students we have quoted. During the crisis of the last twenty years, which has now reached America too, the historians lost their broader contact with life. Yet the role of history ought to become increasingly important in this present formation period because the coming years will seek to re-institute basic human values. It must be a time of reorganization in the broadest sense, a time that must find its way to universalism.

The coming period must bring order to our minds, our production, our feeling, our economic and social development. It has to bridge the gap that, since the onset of mechanization, has split our modes of thinking from our modes of feeling. New inventions, new products, new trends in art are less important than mutual contact between all of these. This means their integration into life. Art must penetrate life and history, too. For this reason, integrated research must survey those broad fields of accomplishment vital to any understanding of our period's growth, but so far neglected. This leads us to the consideration of anonymous history.

#### ANONYMOUS HISTORY

History, if we conceive of it as an insight into the moving process of life, comes closer and closer to biological science. We are interested

today in knowing more than political, sociological, and economic occurrences. We want to know, in the manner of biologists, how the life of a culture took shape. This means exploring what one might call *anonymous history*, i.e., the shaping of a period in everything that concerns its human aspects. In our own period, for instance, this calls for a tracing of our mode of life as affected by mechanization: its impact on our dwellings, our food, our furniture. How did this process affect the organic structure of life?

In the shaping of American life, anonymous history has been especially important. Our tools of production left their impact upon life and society. On our emotive constitution, their effect was profound. They cannot be separated from life and treated as isolated facts. Mechanization and our mode of life must be seen as inter-related. Research is needed into the links existing between industrial methods and methods used outside industry—in art, in the realm of visualization.<sup>1</sup> We shall then see how similar methods arise simultaneously and unconsciously in the esthetic and economic domains. It is here that art historical research will be useful.

Whoever wishes to do research into such constituent but long-overlooked facts will not find them by simply hunting through the illustrated magazines. Anonymous history must be traced back to its roots, and this is the difficulty. For the manufacturers' documents, the advertising leaflets, the catalogues of obsolete models are scattered in forgotten corners or, as is more usually the case, have been destroyed and lost without trace. In addition to the loss of documents and source material, we might list the following difficulties:

1. Lack of planned research
2. Distortion by interested parties
3. Lack of interest.

If an American anonymous history is to be built up, documents are indispensable. But an amazing historical blindness has stood in the way of their preservation. The country that studies the bygone cultures of every continent, financing research and excavation, has neglected and forgotten the witnesses to its own anonymous history. Public opinion, in general, judges inventions and production exclusively from the point of view of their commercial success. This is

<sup>1</sup> The forthcoming *Yearbook on Visual Communication* will print a contribution on the "Visualization of Movement, Scientific Management and Contemporary Art" in which we try to compare the work of a production engineer, Frank B. Gilbreth, with methods of expression in the works of Paul Klee and Joan Miró.



still the prevailing attitude. No values are involved other than profit or loss. A standard answer has been found to excuse this attitude: "We never look backward. We look forward." This means the discarding of time, both of the past and of the future. Only the next day matters.

One cannot blame the industrialist who dumped into the river his own documents or those of his predecessor, one of the most interesting innovators of agricultural machinery in the second half of the last century. Nor can one blame the Patent Office for ridding itself of the original patent models. The historians are to blame. A Romanesque church, its every stone numbered and single-packed for transit to America, would have been regarded as junk by its purchaser, had not three or four generations of art historians proclaimed the splendour of mediaeval art. The industrialist is to be regarded as a tool of production unconscious of any further meaning in his wares. How his production may be evaluated in the pattern of life is for the historian to tell.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE

The awakening of a wider historical consciousness might proceed along two paths:

1) *A Museum of the American Way of Living*

There are objects and documents whose very existence is often unsuspected and which stand witness for the most important period of American development, from the mid-nineteenth century to the present day. This tangible evidence is in great danger of disappearing. Yet it forms a body of clues, of indices to anonymous history, practically the history of life itself. Of course the first condition, and the most difficult one to fulfill, is that the people should understand how their work and their invention—whether they know it or not—are continually shaping and reshaping the patterns of life.

Once historical consciousness is awakened, self-respect will awaken too, a self-respect that inspires every true culture. This renewed awareness will find means of preserving the key witnesses to American history. It will see to it for instance that some of these most precious *monumenta*—the original models formerly in the U.S. Patent Office—will cease to wander, before what remains of them burns in some unprotected barn. Historically speaking this is strewing to the winds the bones of one's ancestors.

Once historical consciousness is awakened, every firm and manu-

facturer will think it worthwhile to preserve samples and documents of its development that they might objectively be woven into the larger pattern.

These sources, if integrated with parallel trends in other fields—the social and economic, the emotive and spiritual—may lead to such a thing as a *Museum for the American Way of Living*.

## 2) *University Chairs of Anonymous History*

This is a difficult and exacting task for which special training is needed. Nothing of the kind is as yet provided for in the curricula of American colleges and universities.

It is a matter of sifting the historically important from the less important. This demands a power of discrimination and even of vision, a hard task and one for which carefully prepared scholars are needed. The universities should train their historians to search out, to understand and to see in a unified way the coming about of everyday life as it is lived around us. Histories of social trends, of successful inventors, of outstanding businessmen are not enough. Library material is not enough, for the necessary data is not in print. One must look to the archives and catalogues of business firms to save what can be saved. Finally, the chairs of contemporary history will have the task not only of showing how the facts are to be gathered but of showing their impact on culture and their meaning for us.

As to financial needs, sufficient funds will come to hand as soon as this historical consciousness awakens from its sleeping state. Should this awareness fail to emerge, nothing else will provide the means, neither boom nor prosperity.

I am aware of the fact that at the present moment there are more pressing tasks to be shouldered than the formation of a Museum for the American Way of Living and of institutions for the training of historians. But things may change more quickly than we think. And in this field too, our period must not enter the peace unprepared.

*New York City*

## THE NEED FOR RESEARCH IN PHOTOGRAPHY

BY NANCY NEWHALL

WE REALIZE vaguely that photography has increasingly influenced civilization for more than a century, yet precisely how and why are questions that are still unanswered. Certain photographic concepts had been growing since the Renaissance; since 1839 photography has been developing simultaneously as art, record, communication, research tool, industry, and science. Yet apart from a few outstanding exceptions, the existing histories are chiefly technical, and the interests of the main authorities restricted. How has photography changed our ways of seeing and thinking? Its arrival was precipitated by a rising demand for pictures. Engravings from daguerreotypes appeared in the early 1840's; by the 1850's albums of original prints and libraries of stereographs lay on every parlor table. Thousands, even millions, of people stared at and studied these photographs of the moon, of Paris and Boston from balloons, of wars, the strange new lands of the American West, and ancient Greece and Egypt. Since the 1880's, nearly everybody has taken and owned photographs. Today, thanks to the photomechanical processes and the movies, an astonishing percentage of information and propaganda reaches the public through photographs. How has this affected social habits, migrations, and political events?

The documentary importance of photographs to any study of American civilization can hardly be overestimated. Nearly every family has a photographic record beginning with daguerreotypes. From the 1840's on, there are not only "studio" portraits reflecting the taste of the time, but interiors of homes, stores, and factories, views of towns, and street scenes. For the last sixty years the amateurs and ordinary snapshooters have been diligently revealing themselves in their innumerable activities. The great records, such as those of the Civil War and the opening of the West, are panoramic in scope. Through such photographs moves the life of multitudes, surrounded by detail of inexhaustible significance to historians. There are a small number of public and private collections and publications centering around an individual, a special subject, or a period. Apart from these, this vast source of visual evidence is virtually untapped.

Research into the influence of photographic forms and concepts on the artistic and intellectual currents of the last hundred years may result in important reversals of current values and theories. For instance, preliminary studies have revealed that certain abstract themes, such as the multiple images of the futurist painters, which had been ridiculed as unrealistic, "anti-photographic," are actually photographic in origin.

The history and development of photography as an art is, to the writer at least, the most fascinating field of all, and one in which America is pre-eminent. Photography in this country has always shown a peculiar power and intensity. Americans took to the daguerreotype as if it were the medium they were born to use. So much so that European critics in those early days were led to explain the superiority of American daguerreotypes by the quality of light on this continent. Photography has reached its broadest popularity here. There are hundreds of people who hold convictions—often ill-founded—on the esthetics of photography about which they are willing to fight.

Our creative achievements, especially during the last fifty years, have reached a significance and a stature which is unique in the world. The greatest protagonist of this period, Alfred Stieglitz, is not only alive but active. Many of the younger men, Strand, Sheeler, Steichen, Weston, are still vigorously at work. Eulogies of these men, particularly Stieglitz, abound, yet the searching and scholarly biographies needed to estimate them and their influence are sadly lacking. So are complete and careful catalogs of their work. An impartial history of that amazing phenomenon, the Photo-Secession, studying its impact on the conservative photographers in Europe and Asia as well as in America, and disentangling the warring ideologies which stem from it, would be of immense value.

The esthetic criteria of photography, first of the so-called "machine" mediums, call for intelligent understanding. Its greatest masters maintain that photography is not mechanical and that the medium of light is as responsive and personal as the medium of sound in music. No two hold the same opinions on the method of printing; and the individuality of each man's work, except in poor or early examples, needs no signature to identify it to the expert. These men and their works were accepted from the start by other artists—even with enthusiasm. The snobbism about photography appears to originate in a misunderstanding on the part of certain critics and "art-lovers" rather than the artists themselves. Doubtless

because of their professional prejudice, true critical writing about photography is almost non-existent. Several distinguished authors, such as Virginia Woolf and Bernard Shaw, have produced vivid and entertaining essays. The critics and art historians have less to show. Since the majority have never taken the trouble to acquire a bowing acquaintance with the subject, they tend either to make preposterous claims or to err on the side of timidity and limited vision. Yet clarification on the esthetics of photography is urgently needed by everyone—and particularly by the appointed educators. Public comprehension is as confused as if, in another field, no distinctions as to intention and effect had ever been drawn between a painting by Rubens, an anatomical diagram, a political poster, and an advertisement for underwear.

The growing interest in photography among schools and colleges has so far been sporadic and uncoordinated. Pressure from the student body or the enthusiasm of an individual instructor have resulted in an exhibition now and then, a lecture or series of lectures, a technical course here and there, an occasional symposium, an undergraduate thesis or two. Before Pearl Harbor there were a number of promising youngsters trying to teach themselves some of the basic requirements for research in photography. Lacking supervision, each of them ran the risk of an unbalanced or over-specialized point of view. Now in uniform, they are still eagerly forming their own collections and writing about their discoveries in distant lands. Undergraduate courses laying a firm foundation for these young enthusiasts would not be difficult to institute. They should comprise: the main developments of the history of photography, an appreciation of its chief esthetic movements and achievements, a survey analyzing and evaluating its various branches and their relation to contemporary life. A practical acquaintance with the basic technics of photography and their creative possibilities is needed, if the scholar is really to penetrate his problems and obtain information from photographers. The necessary study collections of historic and contemporary material can still be built up for a cost in time and money considerably less than that needed for a collection of equivalent importance in a more established field—an advantage for institutional collections which a keen collectors' market in early items promises to nullify within a very few years.

The most challenging problems lie in the field of special research. Of the photographic scholars in this country, only one, Dr. Robert Taft, the foremost authority on the early history of photography in



America, is connected with a university—but he is a professor of chemistry not an art historian. The few of us who are pioneering in this field need help—and ask it. We are trying to prepare essential tools for postwar publications: a comprehensive bibliography and biographical index. In addition, the Department of Photography at the Museum of Modern Art plans to compile a directory of sources: collections, libraries, authorities, pictorial material. It is a vast field. Active research and publication in scores of colleges and universities in the country would scarcely be too much to cover it.

*The Museum of Modern Art*  
*New York City*

## MOTION PICTURES AS A FIELD OF RESEARCH

BY IRIS BARRY

IT WAS the president of a large eastern college who, in a moment of discouragement, said not long ago that his new crop of students appeared to be genuinely interested in little but swing music and the movies. He very much welcomed the idea, therefore, of providing them with material for a considered study of motion picture aesthetics and history since, as he put it somewhat wryly, by inducing them first to cerebrate about films he might afterwards more readily induce them to use their native intelligence about other subjects.

This is a rather desperate attitude for an educator, yet it indicates that the idea of motion pictures as a new field for research, for scholarship and scholarly publication, is not a wholly unknown one. Once upon a time, of course, study of popular novels, or lithographs, or the early history of printing must have seemed equally novel and extra-academic, and there is no longer much opposition to the choice of any particular subject for study merely because it happens to interest the student.

The motion picture, a comparatively new form of communication, is now fifty years old. As an innovation a great many claims were made for it, and many have been made since. At the turn of the century, sober persons were contending that films would revolutionize education, prove to be the obedient handmaid of science, and mitigate if not entirely dispel international misunderstandings and

antagonisms. These dreams seem rather pathetic now, except for the fact that they are still being dreamed and might, conceivably, even come true in some part. They are like the dreams of those who believe that the use of gunpowder and explosives might well be employed exclusively for the purpose of blasting and of firework celebrations: only it is simply not sufficient merely to dream of these things.

When we turn instead to see what in fact motion pictures have accomplished during the past half-century, their achievements turn out to be along very different lines. The spontaneous growth of this almost unimaginably popular form of entertainment has been nourished by an odd combination of genuine creative impulse, of marked technical progress, and of bald commercial expansion and exploitation. The true financial history of American motion pictures, or of French or German, alone would offer to a research student as fascinating a job as has ever been done on the Borgias: and the basic material lies almost untouched. We are all accustomed to hear that films like *The Birth of a Nation* or *The Great Train Robbery* constituted big steps forward in the expressiveness and complexity of the new medium: but we have yet to be told clearly of what this advance really consisted, whether it was accidental or conscious, and what was actually achieved by attempting to relate action or communicate ideas by joining together now one, now another series of images to be projected upon a screen. Is it great editing that makes great films and if so what is great editing? Are there few styles or many? What counter-philosophies led to the abandonment of the methods introduced in the U.S.S.R. by men like Vertov and Pudovkin and Eisenstein after their examination of the work of earlier American directors like Griffith and Ince, in favor of the very different style of films like *Chapayev*? Why has one production company alone in this country, rather than all companies, shown an interest in making films with a socially-conscious or political theme? Is it the function of the motion picture to re-narrate fiction, as in *Gone With the Wind*, and if so can we measure the merit of the picture by its fidelity to the original? Or, as seems most likely, is the motion picture not as different from fiction as is a symphony, in which case the merit of films possibly lies not in their fidelity to a plot derived from a totally different medium, such as fiction or the drama, but on their originality and power as motion pictures? Has fiction itself changed under the influence of the movies and if so how? By what means is the impact

upon the senses provided by *The Fighting Lady* made different from that of *Thirty Seconds Over Tokio*?

The realm of enquiry is endless. Until recently, it would have been difficult to undertake it, since the motion pictures to be examined would have been inaccessible: films were produced, ran through the cinemas of the world, and then vanished. Today this is no longer true, since the Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art has already collected many hundreds of films of all types and periods and from many countries, and these are available for study. More than that, *they are being studied* though, as yet, insufficiently. Colleges and museums throughout the country make use of them and, if they are sometimes seen rather as "old films" with a quaint period flavor, they are increasingly seen by a whole new generation of serious film-students who, however, often lack any particular encouragement or guidance from their local teachers. Even now, from Pacific islands, naval bases and Europe's battlefields a steady trickle of letters comes in to the Museum today from men in uniform who were formerly and hope again to be numbered among such students. Educators will have to reckon with this new appetite for learning in a new field.

If I have mentioned the aesthetic element in motion pictures earlier, as a particularly enticing avenue for exploration, it is because during the last ten years—since the founding of the Museum's Film Library opened up any such possibilities—a much keener interest in the sociological implications of the motion picture has been elicited than in its aesthetic content, and it would be unfortunate if this unbalance were to persist. However this sociological eye to films, too, continues to present infinite possibilities. That they do have an immense influence on public thinking and public feeling is by now commonly agreed and it would seem well, therefore, to discover and measure what this influence is. For the psychologist as well as the sociologist there is a storehouse of material here. Nor is the interest necessarily confined to the fictional film alone, or to the behaviour patterns which gangster films and Superman serials have stamped upon the youthful psyche. We know that the Nazi party was conscious of what it was doing when it harnessed the motion picture to its propaganda service. I suspect that the English official film-makers were much less conscious of the effect *Desert Victory* would have abroad; yet a careful and scientific study instituted by the U. S. Army itself conclusively proved that this one film did much to make the American fighting man respectfully con-

scious of Britain's contribution to the united war effort. Practical results, as well as the honors and pleasures of scholarship, attend the future research worker in film.

For fear I am suggesting that nothing in serious research has yet been attempted, rather than suggesting how much could be done, I should instance here Barbara Deming's illuminating analysis of the content of last year's Hollywood films, "Exposition of a Method" in *The Library of Congress Quarterly Journal*, v. 2, no. 1 (1944). And, as a stimulating example of pioneer work in analysis in another field, there is also Siegfried Kracauer's valuable pamphlet "Propaganda and the Nazi War Film" lithoprinted by the Museum of Modern Art a couple of years ago. In a quite different realm, a great art historian threw brilliant light on the iconography of early motion pictures when Erwin Panofsky published (under the title "Style and Medium in the Moving Picture," *Transition No. 26, 1937*) the text of a lecture he had addressed to a possibly startled audience at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. It is not that these excellent jobs were done that is surprising, but that many more excursions into a field so fertile and so illimitable have not as yet been undertaken. For it is no longer a question of feeble conjecture, hearsay and memory, of dead scrabbling through the inept film criticism of yesteryear: the authentic raw material for research awaits the new expert's eye.

*Museum of Modern Art*  
*New York City*

## EUROPEAN ART COLLECTIONS AND THE WAR: Part II

BY GLADYS E. HAMLIN

THE American Seventh Army has found an almost complete answer to the question "What has happened to the art looted by Goering, Hitler and Company?" In caves, tunnels and castles in southern Bavaria and Austria they found the choicest pieces from Europe's private collections. Paintings, sculpture, tapestries, jewels and other objects from the Rothschild, David-Weill, Kann, Stern, Goudstikker, Wittelsbach and other collections were carefully hidden away. Some were stored in tunnels at Berchtesgarden and in the mountains; in the palace on the island of Herren-Chiemsee

were found about three hundred cases containing works of art from Munich, France and Russia; at the Carthusian monastery of Buxheim, near Memmingen, were a number of cases from France and the Kiev Museum; in Goering's private train found on a siding was part of his private collection and at Neu-Schwanstein Castle in Bavaria, the clearing house for Nazi loot, were discovered not only treasures but records and letters. A letter from Goering to Rosenberg dated November 1940 gave the interesting information, "I consider bringing examples of French culture to Germany of the greatest importance and you may count on the Luftwaffe to help you in any way possible." Rosenberg was the head of the Alfred Rosenberg Art Commission which operated in Western Europe. He was captured by the British in the Flensburg area. Correspondence also revealed that the art thus assembled was intended for an "Adolf Hitler Museum" in Linz and for a "Herman Goering Museum" to be presented to the German people on Goering's sixtieth birthday.

Other records found at Neu-Schwanstein by Lt. James R. Rorimer, Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Officer for the Seventh Army, were twelve catalogs showing that twenty-one thousand works of art, representing over two hundred collections had passed through the castle. The most famous work recorded was the *Adoration of the Lamb* by the Van Eycks. Lt. Rorimer revealed that it had been discovered in a tunnel. Among the paintings in the castle were *The Three Graces* by Rubens and a portrait of the *Marquis de Mirabelle* by Van Dyck.

In addition to the works which he had intended to give to the people, Goering had his own private collection of masterpieces and jewels. The first week in April he became so worried about this collection that he went to Veldenstein Castle and personally directed its packing and the removal at night of part of it into air-conditioned railroad cars which were hidden by day in a tunnel. The 101st Airborne Division later found the train on a siding near Berchtesgaden. Other works they found bricked up in an air raid shelter. A hotel on the outskirts of the town was requisitioned and Goering's private collection was placed on exhibition. Walther Andreas Hofer, a former German art dealer and Goering's personal buyer and curator conducted soldiers and reporters through the exhibition explaining that Goering paid for every object before taking it to Karin hall, his palace near Berlin, where he kept his collection before its removal to Berchtesgaden. Hofer was evasive,



however, when asked where money was obtained to buy such a wealth of art, but related with considerable satisfaction how he outbid Hitler's agent for Rembrandt's portrait of an old man painted in 1660. He said, "We paid a private art dealer in Paris 260,000 marks on the line and took the painting with us. The next day we learned that Hitler's agent had come in too late to boost the Fuehrer's offer." In the collection were other Rembrandts and several paintings by Rubens including *The Bath of Diana* from the Goudstikker Collection and the *Crucifixion* from the Koenig Collection in Amsterdam. From Italy came a Giovanni Bellini belonging to the Count Contini Collection in Florence and a Madonna by Andrea del Sarto. Also included was *Christ and the Adulteress* declared to be by Vermeer. It had been a gift to Frau Goering's nurse from the Reichmarshal. Captain Harry Anderson, fine arts expert for the 101st Airborne Division, discovered it in Schloss Fischhorn, near Zell am See, one of the Goering castles. When Frau Goering denied knowledge of the painting, the nurse brought a four foot stove-pipe wrapped in a blanket. Captain Anderson removed the blanket and revealed the Vermeer which Goering had told the nurse to keep, adding that with such a picture in her possession she would not have to worry about money the rest of her life.

The finding of an even more famous Vermeer, *The Artist in His Studio*, is reported by Captain Felix Harbord, a British Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Officer. He said it was the only Vermeer that appealed to Hitler, who took it with him wherever he went. He acquired it from the Czernin family for a small sum of money after using threats. Harbord also related the strange discovery of rare German art objects dating back to the eleventh century in an ammunition dump near Lueneburg. The British sergeant who made the discovery loaded three trucks with German manuscripts and a collection of old coins and took them to the town hall.

In the Siegen area the First Army found in a tunnel, used as an air-raid shelter by civilians, the famous gold and jeweled sarcophagus from the Cathedral of Cologne, paintings by Van Dyck, Rubens and Rembrandt, and about 500 original scores in Beethoven's handwriting. In Italy 23 cases containing works of art from Italian museums were discovered near Vicenza. Included in the loot were sculptures by Donatello and Giovanni da Bologna and some rare coins. A fortune in art objects was also found in the homes of Vidkin Quisling and of the Nazi Governor-General of Poland, Dr. Hans Frank.

To summarize this report, the public museums in the various anti-Axis countries removed their treasures to repositories before invasion occurred and no great loss as yet has been reported. Dr. Jan Kalf, director of the State Bureau to Preserve Netherlands Art, said that practically nothing that used to be shown in the Netherlands museums has disappeared and nothing of historic value was missing from the royal palaces. A similar report has been received from France. In England more than 2,000 pictures were evacuated first to country homes and museums and then to huge underground caverns under 300 feet of rock in a remote part of the country. Russia removed her art treasures to vaults deep in the Urals. Due to the overconfidence of the Nazi officials German collections may not share the same happy fate. Dr. Paul O. Rave, assistant director of Berlin's National Art Galleries, recommended that the Berlin collections be removed but he was denounced as a defeatist. As a result, when he was finally given permission to take the treasures to the salt mines at Merkers, he had only two weeks to accomplish the task and consequently was able to remove only about one-fourth of the collections. However, Dr. Rave was hopeful about the remainder since they had been buried deep in the vaults of banks and other buildings. Some of the best paintings of Dresden, he said, had been removed to safety. From recent discoveries, one may conclude that the greater part of the private collections had been safely stored and that the difficult problem now remains to unscramble the caches and return the works to their rightful owners.

*The American Commission for the Protection and Salvage  
of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas*

## LETTERS ON THE EDUCATION OF ARTISTS IN COLLEGES

SIR:

Among the various comments on Mr. Longman's article, "Why Not Educate Artists in Colleges?", William Gropper's reply seemed to me to be by far the most pertinent. I must confess to being just as bewildered as he is by the notion that educating artists in colleges will cure the artistic ills of our time. Mr. Longman appears to regard these ills as fundamental and severe, but his arguments on this point are curiously ambiguous: on the one hand, he deplores the low level of contemporary art and attributes it to the artist's lack of humanist education, while at the same time he reproaches the scholar for his inability to appreciate such modern masters as Picasso and Mirò. Surely Mr. Longman does not mean to imply that Picasso and Mirò—and, by implication, Braque, Rouault, Matisse, Paul Klee, Henry Moore, Alexander Calder, and a host of others—have little to say, or that nobody buys their works; but in that case, modern art would not seem to be in such dire need of salvation after all. And as far as the alleged refusal of the university scholar to deal with modern art is concerned, Robert Goldwater's report on the teaching of art in the colleges of the United States, issued two years ago as a supplement to volume II of this journal, suggests that reform is well under way. In 1900, among the courses in the history of art offered by fifty representative liberal arts colleges, only one out of every forty-seven dealt with modern or American art; in 1940, the ratio was one out of eight, and there is no reason to assume that the same trend will not continue in the future.

But to return to the main issue under discussion. Even if it were agreed that modern art is as much in need of salvation as Mr. Longman assumes, the question remains whether or not his proposal offers an effective remedy. Mr. Longman seeks to provide conditions under which the best minds of today will be attracted to the arts; he believes that it is within the power of the colleges to create such conditions. Does past experience lend encouragement to this point of view?

The history of Western art provides ample opportunity to study periods during which the best minds were indeed attracted to the

arts, such as the Florentine Early Renaissance or the 17th century in Holland. What were the special circumstances that brought about such astonishing bursts of creative energy? There is no ready answer to this complex problem, but one thing appears certain: these creative achievements owed little or nothing to any particular system of art education. They were not preceded by any substantial changes in the existing methods or facilities for the training of artists. The conditions that induced these periods of artistic greatness must have been inherent in the state of society as a whole, economically, politically, intellectually, and spiritually. It seems obvious that these factors, which mould both the artist's own character and, in Gropper's phrase, "the life around him," will always exercise an immeasurably stronger influence upon the level of artistic production than any special methods of art education. Thus the only effective means of reforming the art of today is to reform society as a whole, a process in which the college teacher rarely has the opportunity to play an important part. Still, the liberal arts colleges can make a significant contribution towards the aim set by Mr. Longman. One of the conditions necessary for the flowering of artistic talent is the existence, in sufficient numbers, of intelligent and discriminating art patrons; by teaching their students how to derive intellectual and emotional satisfaction from works of art the colleges can stimulate the artistic production of our own time much more effectively than by attempting to train artists. Let it be stated, by the way, that most college courses in the history of art are directed towards this very purpose. They do not attempt to turn out "men with the outlook of art historians," as Mr. Longman assumes. That such courses, as well as others in the college curriculum, may be of benefit to artists is hardly subject to dispute. As Mr. Gropper puts it, "any artist worth his salt ought to know the history of art," which is his heritage as much as ours. Most artists, even if they do not have the opportunity to attend college classes, will acquire as much knowledge of this field as they desire by assembling a small library of books on the subject. It should be emphasized also that the association of the Renaissance artist with the scholars and humanists of his day was usually completely informal—not in the class rooms of the universities but among private circles of friends and patrons. It is difficult to see how this can be regarded as a possible argument for Mr. Longman's point of view. His query, "Is there any sense in which a Leonardo may be unworthy of association with a university?" suggests some rather

intriguing possibilities; Leonardo would indeed be worthy, but how successful his association with the art department of a modern American university would be, both from his own and the university's standpoint, that is another question. Is it not likely that the dean might have cause for alarm over Leonardo's irregularity in attending classes or his lack of concern with grades and schedules? There also might be severe interdepartmental difficulties due to Leonardo's insistence on dabbling in several different fields at once. And what the campus gossips could do with his passion for secretiveness, his refusal to take part in any of the regular social activities on the campus! No, we can be reasonably sure that the association would not work out satisfactorily—and would the situation be so very different if we put Picasso or Mirò in Leonardo's place?

This brings us to what seems to be the core of the entire argument: what is under discussion is not the possible benefits of a college education for the modern artist but the question whether a formal course of training should be provided for him on the campus, whether academic credits and degrees, including the Ph.D., should be awarded on the basis of "theses" consisting of works of art instead of the conventional kind. This decision, however, involves educational economics more than it does educational philosophy. It has often been lamented that the past fifty years have witnessed a considerable inflation of academic degrees, due in part to the increasing commodity-character of higher education as expressed by the many slogans intended to suggest that a college degree is a wise investment in terms of later financial returns. If the granting of degrees for artistic achievements were to become a general practice, it would mean a further step in the same direction. An academic degree is valid only insofar as it stands for some measurable amount of knowledge and ability. While it is true that there is considerable variation in the standards for a given degree among the institutions of higher learning in this country, these standards are reasonably uniform within each individual institution. I submit that it would be impossible to establish any kind of standard for the quality of artistic achievements, and that therefore any degrees awarded for such achievements would be utterly meaningless. There can be no quarrel with the issuance of certificates or diplomas attesting that a student has reached a given level of technical competence, or that he has completed a certain number of years of work to the satisfaction of this or that school, but such certificates should not be construed as a measure for the artistic ability of the



student. And in any event, they should be clearly distinguished from the traditional academic degrees, which represent, or should represent, a very different kind of achievement.

But there is danger in Mr. Longman's proposal not only for the colleges but also for the artists themselves. As Gropper observes, "graduation with a degree or diploma in the field of art does not make an artist; in fact, if such were the case, his education would be considered finished. The creative artist does not graduate." Because of the established prestige of academic degrees, the artist who has one may easily come to be looked upon by the uninformed as ipso facto superior to the artist without a degree. This, in turn, would result in the former's receiving preferential treatment with regard to commissions and employment solely on the basis of his degree rather than of his creative ability. The unorthodox, the non-conformists, would have an even harder time holding their own than they do today. Even now, there is a noticeable tendency among art schools and colleges to engage as instructors only those artists who hold degrees. On the level of the elementary and high school, where the task of the art teacher is mainly pedagogical, qualifying degrees and certificates are entirely necessary and proper; but to extend the same system to the men who are expected to represent the artistic forefront of our time may easily turn out to be disastrous.

H. W. JANSON  
*Washington University*  
*Saint Louis*

SIR:

The obvious reason for not educating artists in college is that a young person aspiring to be an artist must devote for several years many hours a day to mastering the technique of his or her art. Such a student has neither time nor energy left to devote to the courses that constitute a college curriculum.

Accordingly, such a student has no place in a college unless we are to accept the hours devoted to, say, drawing and modelling, as equivalent to as many hours devoted to literature, history, the sciences, etc. Will any sensible person admit this equivalent?

The whole discussion is based on a misunderstanding of the problem of the liberal education of the artist. He normally gets it, not in the collegiate-four-year-original package, but over many years of experience in living. Thus, he gets the education he needs, and it is usually a good education.

For over fifty years, I have had a wide acquaintance with artists, only one in ten of whom ever darkened college doors. With very few exceptions, my artist friends have moved as intellectual equals among college graduates of distinction in the learned professions. It seems to me to be rather a case of letting well enough alone than of inflicting a new headache upon colleges already sufficiently headachy.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.  
*Washington Crossing, Pa.*

SIR:

You suggested that I might wish to comment informally on the four replies to my article, "Why Not Educate Artists in Colleges?", which were published in the March issue of the JOURNAL. It is gratifying that all four agreed with the principle involved, as appears in Mr. Gropper's second paragraph, in the first paragraphs of Mr. Barnes and Mr. Brendel, and throughout in Mr. Sepeshy's reply which seems most completely in accord.

Mr. Barnes evidently believes that most university art departments, as now constituted, would likely be more harmful than helpful in the education of an artist. I think this is because they have never thought of undertaking the task, and hence do not have faculties which would be competent to deal with the intellectual and technical problems involved. Perhaps Mr. Barnes traces the matter to the same cause, since he stresses the empty erudition and the lack of comprehension of modern art noticeable in so many college-educated art students. He says "college education as carried out in some of the most highly esteemed institutions . . . does practically ruin potentialities," etc. I cannot find anywhere that he objects to the principle of using the resources of the university to prepare educated artists. He objects rather to the present academic personnel.

Mr. Barnes raises an important question, however, when he asks how we educate artists at Iowa without a "collection of original works of art that would show the traditions of all times." My answer is that every university should have as good a collection as possible and that we would like to have the Barnes Collection at the University of Iowa and the Metropolitan Museum for good measure. Certainly Wood, Benton, and Curry are no substitutes for even one good picture by Matisse or Picasso, and I agree with all Mr. Barnes has to say about them.

On the other hand we have had and now do have a number of

good teachers and good artists on the staff; and we have many thousands of color reproductions, color slides, black and white slides, and a good art library. I grant that this doesn't take the place of the same number of originals. But no collection of originals is complete either; it must be supplemented with reproductions. Mr. Barnes cannot bring Ravenna's mosaics and the Arena Chapel to Philadelphia. He must use reproductions whenever necessary, but he doubtless uses them wisely, to educate a human being who wants to put his knowledge to some personal use, and not simply to illustrate a recondite historic fact. The radio would be a good instrument of musical education in the right hands, though its music is a reproduction. It is preferable to have the original orchestras or paintings always present, but one is not completely lost without them. And one may import first-class originals and often visit the best museums.

Moreover, a big university has many educational resources outside the field of art which an art school cannot afford. This may more than balance the educational advantage of having a comprehensive collection of originals always at hand. I am sure the Barnes Foundation has some good substitute, perhaps in the form of a small, well-selected staff of instructors in the various subjects of higher learning, and I hope sometime to learn more about it at first-hand.

Mr. Brendel's remarks seem to call for another article on the curricular organization best adapted to an artists's education. Naturally if one accepts the principle of educating artists in universities one confronts this problem immediately. It is not easily solved because there is no precedent. It demands pioneering. Art schools have never had and usually have not coveted the university's resources; and the few universities which have tried educating artists have ordinarily established an academic art school in their midst without realizing that this was merely the easiest and most obvious thing to do.

With regard to Mr. Brendel's last comment "I am not yet quite convinced that the capacity to produce *can* be taught," it seems to me that this introduces only a pseudo-problem and that we are really in agreement. Certainly we cannot give a student a capacity he does not have. But no teacher worthy of his profession would continue if he did not believe he could educate in the strictly etymological sense of the word. One can draw out all the talent that is present. Art historians who are merely informative and studio

teaching which is merely technical are simply not good. And anyone who has taught art to artists for a number of years has seen them grow in understanding, and hence has seen their work mature esthetically as well as technically, and has seen it increase in richness, in complexity and human significance, gradually as a rule, but sometimes suddenly. He doesn't always know just how the transformations took place, and may be anxious (as I am) to undertake controlled experiments in the psychology of art in order to learn more about how it works. Unfortunately the student often cannot explain it either except in a general way. It would seem therefore that the question whether the "capacity to produce" can be taught is purely semantic.

Finally, I should like to express whole-hearted approval of Mr. Brendel's fourth paragraph. The expression "creative" should certainly not be reserved for the artist's work in contrast to the historian's. Both may be equally creative; the medium only is different. Both are artists; "intuition" works the same way in both; and both may have wisdom as well as knowledge. I resent the pampering of the artist which would assume that he has some special talent because he works in the medium of graphic symbols instead of verbal symbols. Mr. Brendel is right that we should not judge the subject of art history and criticism by its worst exponents, any more than we should judge artists by inferior representatives. Mr. Brendel has cited some excellent historians. I overstated the case by emphasizing the defects of the average archaeologist or "humanist," who has little interest either in the contemporary artist or in the twentieth century, and who nevertheless insists on dominating many art departments in order to reproduce his kind. He should reproduce, of course, but art departments should be concerned primarily with the spiritual issues and the excitement of life and art in our own time. Even history should be dedicated to this end in undergraduate instruction. The sciences know all this and that is the main reason why they flourish while the humanities are on the defensive in college education today.

LESTER D. LONGMAN  
*Univeristy of Iowa*

*Postscript after reading above letter from H. W. Janson.*

I do not propose that universities as now constituted can provide a proper education. How could that be possible when, as Mr. Janson points out in his letter published above, only one-eighth teach modern art. Furthermore, most of these treat the subject only historically.

And, fantastic as it may seem to all intelligent artists, many stop with Cézanne in a course called modern art instead of starting with him. It does not follow from this, however, that the university could not become the best vehicle of art instruction, as it is of science instruction, if an imaginative program were devised.

It is not inherent in the nature of artists, unless one is an incurable romanticist, that they are more intolerable in the university than are geniuses in science, history, or literature. Certainly genius is often, and perhaps necessarily unconventional. But the best universities would not refuse Einstein a position on the ground of unconventional conduct, or even Bertrand Russell. One rejects geniuses only if they are so difficult that it would be hard to accept them in any civilized society; and men are not better scientists on this account. Only the weaker universities would do otherwise. This, then, is a frequent fault of the university and not an argument against the principle under discussion. Let the university reform.

The life of the streets will affect the nature of the artist's work, as Mr. Janson remarks, but it will not, as he believes, determine the level of the artist's achievement. Where, then, is the virtue of leaving his education to chance? The mood of the streets will surround him anyhow. It would be just as reasonable to leave the scientist's education to chance, as did indeed happen before universities realized that laboratory courses were not too undignified for their halls. Only a prejudice for undisciplined romantic intuition in the arts could, in this matter, distinguish between art and science. Of course, you can't "grade" Picasso. You can't "grade" Einstein either, but you can a science student. We are not talking about "making" geniuses, but about providing the best education for artists as a group and about raising the general level of production in America.

The question of granting degrees to artists is unimportant to the main issue. I do not, however, grant that this could not be done wisely. No one is a finished historian or scientist at the moment he is awarded a degree, so why should we expect that of artists? Moreover, when one examines a graduate in history it is not primarily to see whether he knows a body of facts (I hope), but to see whether he is a creative scholar. This is the same kind of intangible judgment as that which would estimate the qualifications of the student-artist.



## OBITUARIES

### WALTER CURT BEHRENDT

Dr. Walter Curt Behrendt, Professor of City Planning and Housing at Dartmouth College, died on April 26. Active in the Navy V-12 training program during the war, he continued teaching until his final illness.

Dr. Behrendt, who was 60, had a distinguished career as a German government official before his advent to this country in 1934. Born in Metz in 1884, he studied as an architect and engineer, and entered government service in 1911. In the first World War he fought two years on the Western Front, returning to Berlin in 1919.

For the next fourteen years, in posts of increasing responsibility in the Ministries of Public Health and Finance, he took an important part in shaping German Housing and Planning policy. He was in charge of various technical and administrative aspects of the huge German housing program of the 1920s, and served as a consultant in several Regional Planning developments.

Though busy with important government responsibilities, Dr. Behrendt found time to study and advance the cause of modern architecture in a series of books, to participate actively in the Deutsche Werkbund, and to serve as editor of the magazines *Die Volkswohnung* and *Die Form*. He was also critic and architectural editor for the *Frankfurter Zeitung* for many years.

When Hitler came to power, Dr. Behrendt left a lifetime of service and achievement in his native country to seek freedom and hope in the United States. His first post in this country was as Lecturer in City Planning and Housing at Dartmouth during the years 1934-1937. While there he wrote *Modern Building: Its Nature, Problems, and Forms*, an outstanding contribution to the understanding of modern architecture.

In 1937 he was called to Buffalo, as Technical Director of the Buffalo City Planning Association, and Professor of City Planning and Housing at the University of Buffalo. Projects for the redevelopment of downtown Buffalo aroused widespread civic interest, and through his articles and lectures Dr. Behrendt came to be nationally known in the fields of architecture and planning.

In 1941 he returned to Dartmouth, where he taught during his remaining years. He became an American citizen in 1941, and in

the following year built a new home, a distinguished example of modern architecture, in Norwich, Vermont. (See *Pencil Points*, February, 1945.)

Dr. Behrendt was what Nietzsche called "a good European": the inheritor of that civilization slowly and painfully built up through the centuries. If, when he came to the new world, he found freedom and hope, it was as much because he brought them with him as because they were here. We, too, were bewildered, divided, confused, forgetful of our own great tradition. But the good European became a good American. He believed with Hamilton that intelligence and foresight were necessary if citizens were to create a good society; he saw that it was ultimately the responsibility of government to provide for the general welfare, as the founding fathers had written into the Constitution. He shared with Jefferson, Lincoln, Willkie, and Roosevelt the deep faith in the capacity of plain and simple people to establish and maintain such a government. This conviction he imparted to his students. And yet he knew that the good life for an individual or for a society must be informed with purpose and armed with direction. "Tradition," he once said, "is of value only when it is behind us, pushing forward."

His neighbors knew his inspiring friendliness which is the simple essence of democracy, and no student who sat under him had the slightest doubt what he was fighting for as one by one they left to join the armed forces of their country.

Dr. Behrendt is survived by his wife, Lydia Hoffmann Behrendt, the distinguished concert pianist.

HUGH S. MORRISON

*Dartmouth College*

#### C. MORGAN MARSHALL

C. Morgan Marshall, Administrator and Secretary of the Board of the Walters Art Gallery, died on March 30, 1945, in his 64th year. Mr. Marshall's direction of the Walters Gallery began shortly after its incorporation in 1933; his wise and devoted guidance determined in greater part its development as an active institution.

By profession an engineer, Mr. Marshall became consultant to Henry Walters in all matters pertaining to the maintenance of the Gallery, and the intimate knowledge he acquired of the extensive Walters collections contributed greatly to a comprehension of the history of art which increasingly won him wide esteem among those with formal and professional training in the field. He possessed

a fine faculty of discrimination in judging artistic quality and a remarkably sure sense of what is fitting in arrangement and display. These abilities enabled him to render a service of great value in presenting the Gallery's varied material. His absorbing interest in technical investigation found expression in the promotion of a laboratory which will long play a vital part in revealing the character of a great collection.

Mr. Marshall's uncommon executive capacity was recognized in many quarters, as is witnessed in his election to numerous committees, commissions, and boards, frequently as chairman. Among the city's cultural institutions he was president of the Maryland Institute, and a trustee of the Baltimore Museum of Art and of the Municipal Museum. His loss is a severe one in many places, and nowhere more than at the Walters whose advancement he did so much to create. A man of singular charm and beauty of character, there are few who can inspire loyalty and friendship in such measure. To his associates he leaves a deeply cherished remembrance of affection and respect.

EDWARD S. KING

*Walters Art Gallery  
Baltimore*

## NEWS REPORTS

### REPORT OF THE CAA COMMITTEE ON THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN ART<sup>1</sup>

A meeting of the Committee was held in New York, February 16. Present were Mrs. McClelland, Messrs. Baldwin, Barr (Chairman), Huntley, Kubler, Schmeckebier, Tselos, and, ex officio, Mr. Crosby. Absent: Mr. Egbert.

#### STATUS OF THE COMMITTEE

The committee was originally an informal liaison group appointed by President Crosby in August 1944 to cooperate with the American Art Research Council, an inter-museum organization with headquarters at the Whitney Museum of American Art. The Chairman reported that the Executive Committee at a meeting in November 1944 had given the Committee a formal standing, expanded its functions (as indicated below) and given it the title Committee on the History of American Art.

#### COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN ART RESEARCH COUNCIL

The Chairman of the Committee has worked in frequent and friendly consultation with Lloyd Goodrich, the Director of the American Art Research Council.

An article entitled "The American Art Research Council and the Colleges" urging that more research and publication in the American field be undertaken by University art historians and describing the work of the Council was published in the *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL*, issue of November 1944.

Lists of addresses of College department heads were made available to the American Art Research Council for mailing pamphlets and questionnaires.

The Council continued to render service to university scholars concerning subjects for articles or theses on American painting, making available its lists and files of photographs.

<sup>1</sup> The members of the Committee are:

- Chairman, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Director of Research in Painting and Sculpture, Museum of Modern Art
- Martin Baldwin, Curator, Art Gallery of Toronto
- Professor Donald Drew Egbert, Princeton University
- Professor G. Haydn Huntley, University of Chicago
- Professor George Kubler, Yale University
- Professor Amy Woller McClelland, University of Southern California
- Professor Laurence Schmeckebier, University of Minnesota
- Professor Dimitris Tselos, Bryn Mawr College

Mr. Barr's report, which he read to the Directors of the College Art Association on February 17, 1945, is here published in a slightly revised form which has been approved by the Executive Committee of the Association.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

A. *Preamble:* The Committee believes that there is today a very great and growing interest in the history of American art, particularly the art of the United States. This interest is both general and scholarly. It shows itself in popular magazines, in museum exhibitions and publications, in the general publication of books and monographs and in the extraordinary number of undergraduate courses in American art which have increased 400 per cent in recent years. (See Robert Goldwater's article "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the United States," C.A.J. II, 4, Supplément.)

The interest in the history of American Art is parallel (and often out-distanced) by comparable interest in American political, social, military and literary history.

In many colleges it is clear that broad courses of study in American culture and civilization are to be a very important part of the post-War curriculum. Yet the Committee believes that university departments of the history of art are in general not adequately prepared to take their part in these programs, particularly on the graduate school level where teachers and scholars are trained.

The Committee feels that the university art departments have an immense opportunity and, indeed, an urgent obligation, to accept responsibility for work in the American field. This would involve scholarly research and publication by professors, the training of graduate students, cooperation with other college departments concerned with the study of American civilization, and with non-academic scholars and institutions, such as museums, libraries, historical societies, etc.

The committee accepted with whole-hearted approval the Executive Committee's statement that its scope should include "architecture, sculpture, painting, graphic arts, industrial arts, photography, movies, etc." It was pointed out that architecture had been the American field in which university scholars had up till now been most active but that the other arts should receive comparable attention.

The Committee commends the work of the American Art Research Council but feels that the Council's program, in practice at least, is limited primarily to the study of American painting, particularly the cataloging and documentation of the work of individual artists. To this excellent purpose the Committee wishes to give continued support and cooperation but believes that the College Art Association should take a broader interest in American art by concerning itself not only with the whole range of the visual arts but also with their place in relation to the great historical traditions of Western Culture, to American civilization as a whole and to the related culture of other countries.

In this connection the Committee acknowledged the special importance of the other countries of the Western Hemisphere but agreed that Latin-American art, *per se*, should not come at present within the scope of the



Committee. (Canada however is already represented by a Committee member.)

B. *Specific Suggestions:* Believing that the Directors of the College Art Association will gladly accept its responsibility for the advancement of research and education in the American field, your Committee makes the following suggestions:

1. That special scholarships in the History of American Art be established.
2. That lists of scholarly work in progress, books, long articles and theses, in the field, be compiled and published by the College Art Association (with the help, when advisable, of other organizations such as the American Art Research Council).
3. That lists be published of specialists and institutions that may be consulted on scholarly problems in the American field.
4. That lists be published of collections of documents and photographs.
5. That annotated or critical bibliographies of both a specialized and general nature be compiled and published especially for undergraduate teaching.
6. That scholars be encouraged to publish accounts of special problems and techniques involved in American studies such as community or regional art, the work of living artists, popular and folk art, commercial art; industrial design, the history of new media such as the movies and photography, the use of local sources, business records, dealers' books, etc.
7. That facilities for publication of American researches be brought to the attention of University scholars, particularly the hospitality toward articles in the American field on the part of the editors of the *Art Bulletin* and *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL*.
8. That there be exploration of possible support for American studies, from the College Art Association and other sources.

#### ARTICLES AND ART NEWS FOR EUROPE

Editors of several European periodicals are requesting articles and art news from this country. Erik Larsen, editor of *Pictura*, a *revue d'art ancien et moderne* published in Brussels, asks for contributions from art scholars in this country. Manuscripts will be remunerated. *Graphis*, a new publication in Switzerland is interested in articles or material for articles on the applied arts. *Formes et couleurs*, a French Swiss art journal asks for recent news and commentaries on literary, theatrical and artistic activity in the United States.

The Foreign Information Research Division of the Office of War Information, 224 West 57th Street, New York City, is interested in the resumption of cultural exchanges and can undertake to see that communications will reach the designated parties.

## ENDOWMENT AT INSTITUTE OF FINE ARTS

Mrs. Edith Straus, widow of the late Percy S. Straus, has made a gift of \$100,000 towards the endowment of the New York University Institute of Fine Arts in memory of her husband, former Chairman of the Board of R. H. Macy and Co. and a leader in the founding of the Institute, it was announced by Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, Chancellor of the University. Plans for the endowment are now being carried on under the leadership of Robert Lehman, who succeeded Mr. Straus as Chairman of the Council Committee on Fine Arts.

At present more than 100 graduate students are enrolled in the Institute, according to Professor Walter W. S. Cook, director.

## SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

The College Art Association of America announces the awarding of Grants-in-Aid of research in the Fine Arts to three young graduate students of the History of Art who are completing their work for the Ph.D. degree. These grants have been made possible through the generosity of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. An award of \$900. has been given to Miss Margaret E. Ames who will complete her courses for the Ph.D. at New York University. Her doctor's thesis entitled "Early Christian and Byzantine Monuments in the Mediterranean World" has been written this year at the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library in Washington under the direction of Professor Richard Krautheimer of Vassar College. A second grant of \$900. has been awarded to Miss Patricia Egan to continue work for the Ph.D. degree at New York University. During the past two years Miss Egan has been Art Librarian and Instructor at Vassar College and already holds a M.A. degree from Washington University. An award of \$500. has been given to Gustave von Groschwitz to pursue graduate study during the coming year at New York University. Mr. von Groschwitz has been Curator of Prints at Wesleyan University from 1938 until the present time. In making these grants the Committee on Awards has been guided by considerations both of the scholarly accomplishment and promise of the candidates and their financial need.

## DESIDERATA

The American Art Research Council, established by the Whitney Museum of American Art, is gathering material for a biography of the late Marsden Hartley, in collaboration with Mr. Hudson D. Walker. A complete catalogue of his work is also being made. We would be most grateful to anyone who has letters from Hartley if they would allow us to borrow them. We are also tracing works by Hartley in private collections and would be interested to hear of any paintings, drawings and pastels which are privately owned. Correspondence should be addressed to the American Art Research Council, 10 West 8th Street, New York 11, New York.

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

MAX SCHOEN, editor, *The Enjoyment of the Arts*, 336 p., 63 ill. New York, 1944. Philosophical Library. \$5.00.

*The Enjoyment of the Arts* is a collection of eleven essays, "prepared," according to the jacket, "for those lovers of the arts who desire to increase their love by understanding." The editor leads off with a chapter on the general nature of art; the next nine are devoted to specific arts and the final one to the problem of criticism. It should be said in Mr. Schoen's defense that, with the science of esthetics in its present chaotic state, a wholly coherent symposium on such a topic is probably an unattainable ideal; but the book leaves one with an impression that he made no serious effort to reach it. He might profitably have laid down more exacting specifications for his authors. He could have increased the effectiveness of their contributions by arranging them according to the type of treatment adopted rather than in an order based merely on the nature of the arts with which they deal, or at least by devoting several pages of his introduction to interpreting them and relating them to each other. And a few of them could have been greatly improved by a little routine textual revision.

Three of the chapters conform closely to the announced purpose of the book—Thomas Munro's on painting, Glen Haydon's on music, and David Daiches's on poetry. Each is fundamentally a good pocket-map to the art in question and, if consulted frequently, like a map, instead of being placed on the top shelf after one reading, ought to make a practical guide to the territory. The fact that each author uses, so to speak, a different projection for transferring his three-dimensional subject to the flatness of paper ought not to be unduly confusing. Mr. Munro, for example, describes the various objectives that a painter may choose and the mediums and methods with which he may pursue them, and then adds a few pages on the problems of appreciation. It is tolerant, illuminating, and very easy to take. Mr. Haydon, as if to complement this approach (but unfortunately eight chapters later), concentrates on the internal structure of music, explaining clearly the various types of relationship that a composer may use to draw his separate notes together into a unified and moving piece. Few writers have managed to say so much about music, and say it so simply and so well, in so small a space. Mr. Daiches, in turn, by-passes the study of structure in order to discuss the dynamics of poetry—the way in which each of its ingredients, the meaning of the words, their sound, their associations, their order, their accents, and the way in which the poet apprehends his subject, serves to modify, to inter-

pret, and to intensify all the rest. He presents a poem as an intricate bit of counterpoint in which every strand makes some original contribution to the whole instead of merely serving as an accompaniment to the rest. Being a closely knit piece of original thought rather than an attempt at popularization, it is not particularly easy to take—but anyone who can will probably find it the most rewarding item in the book. It should be read, however, after Mr. Haydon's chapter rather than before it.

A second trio of contributors ostensibly subordinates the purveying of understanding to some ulterior purpose, but they are such careful workmen that the net loss is small. Milton Fox, instead of cataloging the resources of the movies with encyclopaedic impartiality, plays up montage as the most promising of all, as "the poetry of movie expression," but anyone who looks for montage in a film, as Fox directs, is not likely to miss many of its other virtues. Van Meter Ames takes as his text, "The novel is a device for self-development," and has few words to spare for the promotion of enjoyment; but as most people are able to enjoy most fiction without help, this treatment might well be accepted as a wise detour around a ponderous chain of platitudes. Antonin and Charlotta Heythum, in their chapter on the Industrial Arts, are more interested in the taste of the reader than in his personal development, but not so much on his immediate account as because if his taste can be improved he will select, among the products of the industrial arts, better and better designs, and this, in turn, will influence the designers and the manufacturers of such objects to produce more good pieces and fewer bad ones. It is one definite contribution which an understanding of art can make to a better world, for, while the other arts can be turned on or off at will, the industrial arts are always with us.

Whether these six wholly admirable chapters will be able to carry the varying weights of the other five can be determined only by experience. It may be doubted whether such a haphazard mixture will have much value as a textbook, but the chapters mentioned, and many single paragraphs from the others, might profitably be recommended for collateral reading.

Mr. Gabor's statement that Phidias built the Parthenon ought to be corrected in any future edition.

CARL THURSTON  
Pasadena, California

ERLE LORAN, *Cézanne's Composition: Analysis of His Form with Diagrams and Photographs of His Motifs*, vi + 141 p., ill. (1 pl. in color). Berkeley, 1943. University of California Press, \$6.50.

Roger Fry once said that the artist is an unreliable critic so long as he regards things from his personal creative point of view. He did not mean that the peculiar discrimination of a creative attitude blocks all critical

insight, but that the special concentration of interest might reduce the range of considerations which are required for a balanced appraisal. As "a young painter passionately devoted to the art of Cézanne," Mr. Loran lived and worked for more than two years in that artist's studio at *Aix-en-Provence*. The present book is a later product of this devotion. Its elucidation of some formal aspects of Cézanne's late work reflects sympathy and painstaking research; but the contention that certain characteristics of this form should be accepted as criteria of all painting is open to serious question.

Students who are concerned with the pictorial representation of nature will find the analytical procedure convenient. The paintings are described first in terms of their divergence from natural appearance. Photographs of the approximate scenes before which Cézanne originally pitched his easel are published alongside reproductions of corresponding paintings. Selected differences are listed and classified by means of text and diagram. In this way, Cézanne's method of subdividing represented objects into parts which are depicted as if seen from one or more points of view is cataloged in detail. The painting may then be seen as a fixed assembly of aspects which could be perceived under normal circumstances only by a roving eye. The author's second step is to justify the presentation of such a variety of aspects in particular combinations.

At the first step of this analysis, claims may be verified on what might be termed a scientific level; but statements made at the second step refer to a level of understanding which might be termed esthetic. Unfortunately these two levels are not clearly distinguished in some of the diagrams. For example, the potential field of pictorial space is represented in one diagram as a box of which one side acts as the picture plane with the four attached sides extending at right angles to it. At the scientific level this concept is false, because even in a picture by Cézanne the scope of represented space widens with distance from the picture plane. On the other hand, Cézanne's paintings appear formally to block the lateral spatial extension to some degree, and perhaps the confining side-walls in the diagram are intended to assert this characteristic on the esthetic level. Many diagrams contain elements which appeal to one level along with elements which appeal to the other. The effect is not only confusing, but also deceptive to the unwary reader. Often a diagram seems to invest esthetic opinion with the alien authority of scientific fact. This tendency is the more apt to influence the reader unduly in that claims made at the first step of analysis are demonstrable in the book itself, whereas the ideas advanced at the second step depend on more evidence than mere reproductions can supply. Of course a book cannot be condemned by its failure to include evidence beyond physical possibility, but the qualifications thus imposed should not be ignored when they might lead to misunderstanding.

The author's thoroughly documented exposition of Cézanne's representational treatment is not likely to be questioned. The conclusions are



readily verifiable on a level where general agreement is possible. However, it appears that similar conditions are expected to hold on the second level. The author seems to suppose that an esthetic inference should be accepted by everyone, to assume that there is only one valid inference to be drawn from a given formal arrangement, and to suggest that his inferences therefore are obligatory. For instance, many diagrams contain broad arrows to indicate the direction of compositional "movement," and no alternative is considered. This implies that painting shares with music the power of determining a formal sequence, and that esthetic understanding depends on the order in which one unit is apprehended after another.

In his study of Cézanne's integration of the various formal devices which are analyzed in this book, the author concludes that certain previous writers have over-emphasized the functional importance of the now celebrated "color modulations" and have depreciated the activity of line. He himself defines the former as "simply an aid to the illusion of three-dimensionality," and characterizes them as "a superstructure of gorgeous color." His definition of their function is qualified to a point where it is difficult to discover the exact degree of importance he would assign to them. Taken at face value, his statement that "the small color planes are merely incidental" to larger formal issues seems extreme. One might accept the term "subordinate," but the word "incidental" suggests that the small color planes are inessential. To imagine their removal, one must picture pervasive structural changes in the form; and surely an element without which such a transformation would occur can be considered essential. Yet in the text a diagram described as "simply a tracing around the outer contours of the large areas of the picture" is used to illustrate the claim about a Cézanne painting that "the essential plane and space relationships are thus established by *outlines*."

This argument is supported by an account that Cézanne always began his pictures with silhouettes which subsequently were filled with the small color planes. Apparently this initial stage in the painter's procedure has been identified in the author's thinking with the notion of a dominant formal factor. If so, levels of reference again are confused. Esthetic analysis is not clearly separated from technical analysis.

Apart from its unfortunate influence on esthetic judgment, the detailed description of Cézanne's technical means and method should be useful to the student painter who is interested in his work. The student might also benefit from the frequent stimulating comments of a fellow artist who is inspired by Cézanne and who has made a prolonged study of his form.

But while the book might be recommended in these respects to an individual reader, its general conclusions are too narrow for serious consideration by all students of art. Cézanne is credited with the restoration to the tradition of western painting of "the basic principles that have given the eternal qualities to the art of his great predecessors. . . . The art of

the future cannot fail to be better for learning and accepting them." The principles are described as "classical structure and a recognition of the fundamental precepts of picture plane and picture format." Mr. Loran defines the concepts of picture plane and picture format thoroughly, and his argument in favor of their relevance in Cézanne's form is convincing. Their presence in various modifications in pictures produced in many cultures can be demonstrated. But if they are used as criteria, as Mr. Loran proposes, one is forced to condemn the many "exceptions" as "partly unsuccessful pictures." Indeed, this judgment extends to whole periods and styles so that the Baroque, for example, is termed "extravagant." As an artist and an individual, the author is justified in stating his preference; as the precepts of a critic and teacher his demands might be considered an imposition.

DOUGLAS MACAGY

California School of Fine Arts, San Francisco

PAUL KLEE, *Pedagogical Sketch Book*. (Translation by Sibyl Peech), 64 p., 87 ill. New York, 1944. The Nierendorf Gallery, \$3.75.

WILL GROHMANN, *The Drawings of Paul Klee*. 24 p., 72 pl. in portfolio. New York, 1944. Curt Valentin. \$15.00.

During the past decade, the work of Paul Klee has found a rapidly growing circle of admirers in this country. When the news of the artist's death reached us four and a half years ago, there were few students of contemporary art on either side of the Atlantic who did not mourn him as one of the great masters of our time. Nevertheless, it may be said that Klee's reputation, in America at least, is based more on spontaneous enthusiasm than on critical understanding. Until very recently, the paucity of publications in English dealing with the artist's work has rendered a serious study of his achievement difficult indeed. It is thus all the more gratifying that the past year has seen the publication of two books, both of the greatest interest in their own right but particularly so when viewed together, that will introduce the American reader to important and hitherto largely unfamiliar aspects of Klee's artistic activity.

The *Pedagogical Sketch Book* was produced during Klee's association with the Bauhaus, as a "basic plan for part of the theoretical instruction" at that school; first published in 1925 under the title *Paedagogisches Skizzenbuch*, it has long been unavailable. The present edition contains all the original illustrations, as well as translations of the accompanying text and legends. To those who regard Klee as essentially the thaumaturge of his own dreamland, the very existence of this educational effort must come as something of a surprise, especially since he is the only one among the "founding fathers" of twentieth century painting to have undertaken such a task. Klee himself would surely have been the last to minimize the

difficulty of condensing the essentials of his artistic wisdom into a methodic sequence of statements and drawings; yet the very fact that he attempted it would seem to suggest that he believed his art to be communicable and subject to rational analysis to a greater extent than many of his admirers have been willing to admit. How successful he has been in his endeavor remains another problem. As a "basic plan of instruction" the *Sketch Book* presupposes the special environment of the Bauhaus as well as the guiding hand of the author himself; for the American public, therefore, its practical value as a teaching device is severely limited. As a primary source for the study of one of the greatest modern masters, on the other hand, it is of very considerable importance and worthy of much more thorough discussion than can be devoted to it here. The general plan of the *Sketch Book* is itself significant: there are four main chapters, under the headings of "Line, Structure, Movement," "Dimensions," "Earth, Water, Air" and "Symbols of Movement" (e.g. the spinning top, pendulum, circle, spiral, arrow). Problems of representation in the conventional sense are not touched upon at all, with the exception of perspective. Rather, artistic fundamentals are interpreted throughout in terms of mathematics, physics, and biology. The sketches themselves are for the most part free-hand renditions of scientific diagrams, and it is only on rare occasions that Klee's own graphic style is given free rein. This desire to gain an "objective" basis for artistic problems by proceeding from the abstract and general to the concrete and particular, so contrary to the spirit of much of Klee's work and to his own earlier utterances concerning the importance of "inspiration," forms part of a fascinating but insufficiently explored problem: the impact of modern scientific thought upon the art of our time. In the case of Paul Klee, the intellectual preoccupation with the "laws of nature" appears to have been inseparable from a pervading interest in the visual aspects of the world of science; the geometric intricacy of a physicist's diagram held as much fascination for him as the myriad details revealed by the microscope. The imaginative use of forms derived from such sources is encountered frequently enough among Klee's work, but in the *Sketch Book* these shapes lead a curious double life, not yet divorced from their original meaning while already in process of being transformed into artistic gestures. Having thus intruded upon a foreign domain, Klee inevitably lays himself open to attack from the scientist's point of view, particularly towards the end of the *Sketch Book*, where his physics has become a mere cloak for metaphysics, as in his discussion of the "cosmic curve" or of the circle as "the purest form of motion . . . through the elimination of gravity." "Pure" in this context can mean only "esthetically pure" rather than "scientifically pure," since for the physicist the "purest form of motion" means movement along a straight line at constant velocity; however, this concept not only lacks a counterpart in the world of sensory experience but transcends the boundaries of any work of art, so that one could hardly expect Klee to give it a place

in his artistic philosophy. If, on the other hand, Klee is granted the artist's privilege of subjectivity even in matters such as these, then his insistence on scientific procedure becomes little more than a futile attempt to channel the flow of creative thought. In his own work, apart from the *Sketch Book*, this conflict of physics and metaphysics is never apparent; by what feat of magic he was able to reconcile the two will remain one of the mysteries of his genius. The *Sketch Book* provides much food for thought on this problem, but it does not give an answer.

It is unfortunate that the intelligibility of the *Sketch Book* in the present edition suffers to a considerable extent from lack of care in the translation. A number of passages can hardly be understood at all without recourse to the German original. This is particularly evident in the sections on perspective; here the translator simply does not seem to have taken the trouble of familiarizing herself with the accepted English terms in this field, all conveniently listed and defined in any standard dictionary. Instead, she has improvised her own terminology, with most unfortunate results. Moreover, in the two paragraphs accompanying figures 41 and 42, the meaning of the final sentence is reversed by the arbitrary insertion of a "however." Another trip to the dictionary would also have revealed to her that the term "golden rule," which she uses, section I, 7, refers to Matthew 7: 12, rather than to the ratio  $a:b = b:(a+b)$ , commonly designated as the "golden section." Less amusing but equally irritating is the consistent mistaking of tendons for ligaments and vice versa in sections I, 8—I, 11, not to mention such minor slips as "prospective" for "perspective" (section II, 17) or "recession" for "reception" (section I, 13). Fortunately, the drawings themselves are often eloquent enough to clarify the meaning of doubtful passages; nevertheless, a careful revision of the text is highly desirable before further editions of the book are issued.

Will Grohmann's book on the drawings of Paul Klee has had a tragic history. Originally printed in Germany in 1934, the last year of Klee's residence in that country, it was confiscated by the Nazi government before it reached the public. The present edition, prepared from the few copies that survived in private hands, thus has the status of a new publication rather than of a reprint, and its technical excellence gives assurance that it will be able to take the place of the original without loss to the reader. In choosing the plates of the portfolio, Will Grohmann has restricted himself to the period 1921-1930, with particular emphasis upon the later years of the decade. While the scope of his work is thus less wide than the title suggests, few will quarrel with his decision to concentrate on a limited area instead of attempting to survey the entire range of his subject, since Klee himself was still alive and working at the time the selection was made.

Considering the prevalence of linear expression in Klee's work as a whole and his fondness for mixing several media in one picture, it must



have been difficult at times for the author to separate the drawings proper from water colors and gouaches. In order to avoid any possible confusion, his choice had to be based on rather strict technical criteria; almost all the examples reproduced are done in pen, pencil, or crayon on plain white paper, without the use of color or tonal values. As a result, the variety of textures usually taken for granted in Klee's work is completely lacking in these pieces, but their very sparseness and economy permits his inventive genius to emerge more strikingly than ever.

Grohmann very fittingly compares Klee's draughtmanship to a kind of hieroglyphic script and to the picture-writing, the "Ars Memorativa," of the Renaissance. His brief but valuable introductory essay contains numerous other discerning remarks as well, such as his suggestion of an analogy between Klee and James Joyce—many of Klee's symbols might indeed be regarded as the pictorial equivalent of puns and "portmanteau" words—or his reference to the physiognomic studies of the German Romanticist Carus. Grohmann also denies that Klee is "given to childlike or primitive atavism," even though he fails to draw a sufficiently clear distinction between this view and his own statement that Klee expresses "characteristic images embedded in the primitive unconscious." When he tries to illuminate the meaning of Klee's work by referring to Frobenius' dictum on the function of great art, "to recall primitive darkness of which fragments still live in the artist," or when he maintains that "there are no visible turning points in (Klee's) career, for he lives and works out of a fixed center," he lapses into the type of pseudo-profound esthetic suasion that has so frequently marred German art criticism of the past thirty years. In his comments on the plates, Grohmann himself demonstrates that Klee's work is not at all devoid of development, since he points out a number of significant changes in the artist's drawing style during the 1920's. The reader will be able to extend these observations by noting the effect of Klee's association with the Bauhaus and, incidentally, of the *Pedagogical Sketch Book* among the later pieces. If the evolution of Klee's style is too complex to fall into a ready pattern, it must nevertheless be regarded as subject to the same influences that we are able to discern in twentieth century art as a whole. Overworked generalizations about the role of the unconscious will prove less helpful for an understanding of Klee's unique individuality than a reasoned analysis of his work in relation to the various movements which it reflects, such as the *art nouveau*, especially in its symbolist aspects, the *Fauves*, and Cubism. While a comprehensive study of this kind has not been attempted so far, Grohmann's portfolio of drawings represents a contribution of primary importance towards the ultimate fulfillment of the task.

H. W. JANSON  
Washington University  
Saint Louis



*Velázquez, Complete Edition* (Introduction and Catalogue by Enrique Lafuente), 34 p., 176 ill. London, 1943, Phaidon Press. (New York, Oxford University Press.) \$5.00.

This recent volume in the growing series of the Phaidon Press is, like its forerunners, invaluable for its excellent plates. Most of them are full-page, clear and reliable as to details. Many are from recent photographs, taken since the pictures were cleaned, which makes them preferable to the cuts in all earlier Velázquez books. One would like to have found a greater number of color plates. Though no one is to be blamed for this shortcoming—the older available color prints not being good and more recent ones probably unavailable in these times—nevertheless this reviewer must state that this volume is inferior in that regard to the earlier Phaidon Press “Vermeer” with its twenty reproductions in color. It contains only six color plates which are, excepting the *Portrait of Philip IV* in the Frick Collection, neither very trustworthy nor wisely chosen. Two color reproductions of the *Infanta*, both in Vienna, but only one of them by Velázquez, could be dispensed with if, instead, we had a color plate or two of more important canvases from the Prado; say, *The Surrender of Breda*, the *Medici Landscapes*, and *Las Meninas*, to say nothing of the *Portrait of Pope Innocent* from the Doria Gallery in Rome. Black-and-white cuts of these most characteristic creations of Velázquez are apt to mean nothing to a student deprived as we all are at present of the facilities of travel.

The reproductions present, however, the authentic *œuvre* of Velázquez in its entirety. There are differences of opinion, of course, as to what is the “entirety” of Velázquez’ work. In 1925, the late Don Juan Allende-Salazar, counted something like 115 authentic works (which was 22 more than Aureliano de Beruete would concede) in contrast to August L. Mayer’s *Catalogue Raisonné* of 1936 which includes over 600 items. Enrique Lafuente, who is responsible for the present “complete” edition bases his selection on Allende-Salazar, but adds about 18 pictures to the latter’s list in the 4th edition of the Velázquez volume in *Klassiker der Kunst*. Lafuente also contributes a useful chronological table of the life of Velázquez and a catalogue of the paintings and drawings. One will prefer this, particularly for class use, rather than the German notes in Allende-Salazar’s volume, not only because the Phaidon catalogue is in English, but also because it is concise and to the point, giving the provenance of each picture as far as it can be traced as well as critical opinions on authenticity, taken chiefly from Beruete, Allende-Salazar and A. L. Mayer. Lafuente’s discussion of the plates in the introduction brings nothing that would be news to the student of Velázquez’ bibliography.

On the other hand, precisely because of the very limited space allowed for the introduction, it seems regrettable to this reviewer that the author fills most of its eleven and a quarter pages with a kind of super-duper sales talk on the incomparability of the Spaniards and particularly of his hero, Velázquez.

It is beyond dispute that Velázquez belongs to the greatest in the province of painting. Why attempt to elevate him to such heights that nothing, but absolutely nothing, in art can be likened to him? ("be they the stone Pharaohs of Egypt, the Gods of Greece, a Gothic cathedral or a Beethoven Symphony"). And why build up Velázquez, chauvinist fashion, on the pedestal of a Spanish nation superior to all other nations? ("The Spaniard knows that reality is not Idea but Life. . . . Life may be, as Calderon held, a dream, but in the Spanish view of the world when the dream is over, there still is left the individual with his personal responsibility and his yearning for salvation. In this lies one of the profoundest intuitions of the Baroque, but *which Spain alone felt with sufficient intensity to raise it to the plane of art.*" [Italics mine.]

To prove all this, the author unfurls that most unfortunate concept of "the aesthetic of individual salvation," something which "over against all Classic art, Platonizing and archetypal, Spanish painting proclaims as its own."

Of all people, Velázquez, whose paintings reveal "an eye and a brush" of a sober realist if there ever was one, is put through the paces of that concept. Platonizing that it is a joy to behold, the author does not shrink from casting occasional slurs on the contemporaries of Velázquez outside of Spain, which, for their lack of proper perspective, must irritate anyone whose acquaintance with the other great artists of the 17th century is less hopelessly biased. "Among all the portraitists in the history of art there is none who excels Velázquez in the power of salvation of the individual . . . even Rembrandt is too much inclined to revel in the pictorial version of his subject matter." . . . "Unlike Frans Hals, Velázquez does not yield to the virtuosity of technique for its own sake."

Having worked his way through that philosophical jungle of Lafuente's introduction the reader may find some solace in the author's own concluding remark that ". . . ups and downs of passing fashion have nothing to do with historical evaluation. Velázquez enters by his own right into the ranks of the Great Masters." Of this truth the plates of this complete Phaidon edition would convince anyone even if not a word of comment were added.

OSKAR HAGEN

*University of Wisconsin*

Museum of Modern Art, New York, *Lyonel Feininger*. (With Essays by Alois J. Schardt and Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and Excerpts from the Artist's Letters, edited by Dorothy C. Miller) and *Marsden Hartley* (With Statements by the Artist, Foreword by Monroe Wheeler), 96 p. 89 pl. (two in color). New York, 1944, The Museum of Modern Art. \$2.50.

Whatever may be the merit or motivation back of recent attacks on the Museum of Modern Art there is one respect in which it must remain unassailable. Ever since its first publication, it has made it a policy to

issue reliable and handsome catalogues at prices we can all afford to pay.

The present catalog can serve as a practical handbook for teachers in the history of recent painting. It includes factual material, in word and picture, with which a teacher can recreate for his class the work and the ideals for which these two artists are responsible.

Feininger is especially well set off in this record of his theory and practice. And the illustrations, one of them a stunning color reproduction of his *Steamer Odin II*, of 1927 are excellent witness to his remarkable progress from 1906 to 1944. More than any other item in English this present catalog has captured the charm and power of the pure art of Feininger.

Marsden Hartley (1877-1943) carried on, in the isolation of his person and his art, the legend and the fact of the lonely American artist. His painting sometimes suffered because so much of his strength and artistry went into his prose, that excited and trusting strong talk which was perhaps his greatest gift. Hartley, very much unlike Feininger, was the artist who seeks and seldom finds. And they are right who relate him to Ryder. Both men had a somewhat overdelicate, curiously precious regard for painting landscape with feeling. And this subjective reading from nature Hartley could do to perfection in words. In paint, on the other hand, he occasionally missed the mark. What he achieved on canvas was sometimes a hard, coarse, only too obviously physical approximation to the poetic dream with which he may have begun to paint. Hartley was fundamentally sad, Feininger a basically happy artist.

Hartley, when he was successful in paint, gave us an equivalent to the succinct, Puritan-controlled lyrics of Emily Dickinson. Like Miss Dickinson, he carried New England in his heart and so could find no peace. He broke into fragments the feel and fact of New England, more aggressively even than Marin did. His landscape, like that of Marin and Miss Dickinson and his beloved Ryder, is saturated with person, with the work of an individuality only too cruelly felt.

There is in the painting of Feininger a visible impeccable finish held so securely between the limits of the frame as to admit of no loose references outside these limits. But Hartley's pictures are too full of anguish for those who know his story, for those who realize that we had in him an artist much greater in achievement than any of the overpublicized regionalists of our day. He was marked for neglect. He was continually and constitutionally the eternal pioneer forever breaking into new ground.

It is sad to see Hartley next to Feininger in one catalog. Feininger needs no words to establish his position but Hartley does. This is too often the case in America. There is a job of teaching to be done with this Hartley material. Hartley is the great unknown. And he shouldn't be. Failing access to the original paintings themselves, there is certainly no better way for the teacher to present a case for such modern artists as these than with this inexpensive catalogue in hand. This Hartley-Feininger tribute should

not be left dust-covered on a library shelf. It is something we can all use to demonstrate and extend the valid esthetic practice of the more genuine craftsmen of our time.

There is rampant over the country today the notion that if an artist is banal and obtrusively dull he is American to the core. With this goes the idea that an artist of polish and distinction, of more abstract completeness in his forms, is a foreigner to be shunned. The art dealer Mr. N. E. Montross once asked Marsden Hartley to drop into his gallery to see a certain painting. "It was a picture that so affected me," says Hartley, "that I in all truth was never the same after the first moment—for the power that was in it shook the rafters of my being. . . ." The picture was a marine by Albert Pinkham Ryder. And we quote Hartley's words, born of his experience before this picture, for the benefit of the many "Americans" who have refused to acknowledge him as deeply one of ours:

"This picture was a marine by Albert P. Ryder—just some sea, some clouds, and a sailboat on the tossing waters. I knew little or nothing about Albert Ryder then, and when I learned he was from New England the same feeling came over me in the given degree as came out of the Emerson's Essays when they were first given to me—I felt as if I had read a page of the Bible. All my essential Yankee qualities were brought forth out of this picture and if I needed to be stamped an American this was the first picture that had done this—for it had in it everything that I knew and had experienced about my own New England—even though I had never lived by the sea—it had in it the stupendous solemnity of a Blake mystical picture and it had a sense of realism besides that bore such a force of nature itself as to leave me breathless. The picture had done its work and I was a convert to the field of imagination into which I was born. I had been thrown back into the body and being of my own country as by no other influence that had come to me."

When Marsden Hartley rises from the obscurity which keeps him hidden from the greater public it will be with the help of such publications as this used with discretion by teachers aware of the great job of teaching that still lies before us. The errors in this catalogue are few and none is likely to mislead.

JOHN FABIAN KIENITZ  
*University of Wisconsin*

DARRELL GARWOOD, *Artist in Iowa: A Life of Grant Wood*, 259 p., 11 ill.  
New York, W. W. Norton, 1944. \$3.50.

Grant Wood, whose paintings perhaps appealed more to the public than to the art world, was the focal point of numerous well-remembered artistic storms a decade ago. This biography in a sense carries on in the Wood spirit, since it will probably interest the public more than those in the field of art. Like the subject, the book itself has already become a center of controversy.

Last December third, after its publication, the AP wires carried a story originating in Cedar Rapids, on the reactions of several of Wood's



friends to the book. Paul Engle of the English Department of the State University of Iowa, where Wood had been a professor of art, was reported as feeling so strongly about the book that he "can only hope that as few people as possible feel it necessary to buy this book." He claimed that Park Rinard, the artist's secretary, had been requested by Wood to do his biography and that Garwood had obtained his information under false pretenses, saying that the material was to be used for an article to appear in the December 1944 number of *En Guardia*, issued by the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. The article has not appeared as yet, although the latest number of this magazine does contain an unsigned article, one half page long, on the middle western scene, with three colored illustrations of the work of Benton, Curry and Wood.

According to the AP report, John Reid, a member of the Iowa State Board of Education and another friend of Wood's, feels that "there is nothing unscrupulous about the way Darrell Garwood came to me for material about Grant Wood. Any writer with responsible backing who came to Cedar Rapids for research material would have access to my files, and I would tell him all that I knew that I considered favorable about Wood. . . ."

The book itself has some good points and some bad. In the eyes of the public, it would seem to be a frank exposition of the mind and life of an artist about whom most people have at least heard. It gives details such as one seldom gets of artists—his high school grades in history and civics, in zoology and botany; how he wanted his hair "trimmed up close enough so his hatband wouldn't leave a mark." And it gives, now and then in considerable detail, a feeling for the surroundings of some of the privately owned Wood paintings. *Dinner for Threshers* for instance, hangs in a room with ". . . two Holbeins that look like Memlings. . . ."

The author tries to help the reader to a better understanding of the subject of Wood's paintings, again in some detail—"the comments by the members (of the D.A.R.) seemed to come right out of the painting. 'The D.A.R. will carry on its work regardless of these human gnats that buzz around us'—the words seemed to come from the solid, complacent woman on the left."

Another class of readers, those artists and art historians who think that Grant Wood was an important artist, may feel that the appearance of this book was unfortunate, since, although it is called a life of Grant Wood, it does nothing to evaluate his personality and his work in the light of his artistic environment, particularly with the movement called "regionalism," of which we heard so much in the 1930's. And, unfortunately, it will probably skim the cream of the potential buyers of a book on such a controversial and well known man. A second book, by another author, that might be less gossipy and more analytic, might find its sale restricted by the earlier appearance of this work.

The serious student of art, whether he is undecided about Wood's place



in art or not, will regret the omission here of so much that should be in any good biography. The facts are still available, since Wood died only a little over three years ago, and the true picture of the painter can only be achieved by getting these facts, not only from those who are here quoted, but from others who also have much to tell of the artist's relation to his colleagues and his times. There are numerous persons in Cedar Rapids, Iowa City, New York and elsewhere who can give further details which would help fill out a more significant and truer picture of the artist. If some of them were consulted for this work, their information was excluded, perhaps in the interest of making it a more sympathetic portrait. This is one of the outstanding faults of the book—the author seems to be constantly straining to portray Wood as an individual who matches the unsophisticated phases of his painting. The lack of fulness in the portrait may also be due in part to an apparent desire to finish the manuscript in a hurry. Few of the evidences of careful research that one hopes to find in a well rounded biography are here present. Sources of information are mentioned in only the most general way, if at all, and contemporary written evaluations are neglected entirely.

Grant Wood's place in American art would be helped rather than hindered by a more adequate biography. Nothing can soon remove him from the triumvirate that we label the "regionalists"—Benton, Curry and Wood, apparently as inseparable as Homer, Eakins and Ryder. True, each is as different from the others as could be, but Wood is none the less important because he worked meticulously, slowly, and with narrowing subject matter, while Benton and Curry work with comparative speed and ever broadening scope. Each has helped in his own way to make America as conscious of itself as have Sandburg and Steinbeck. Wood, as much, or perhaps more than the others, tried to encourage the growth of art directly from our farm yards and city streets. But Benton's autobiography, *An Artist in America*, and Schmeckebier's, *John Stewart Curry's Pageant of America*, have done much more to help us and future generations to understand their place in America's struggle to free itself from Europe, than this book. This volume will not jeopardize Grant Wood's place among the pioneer regionalists, if a work comparable to the two mentioned above is not too long delayed.

FRANK J. ROOS, JR.  
Ohio State University

NARITO TOICHIRO, *The Wall Paintings of Horyuji* (Translation by William R. B. Acker and Benjamin Rowland, Jr.), xvii+316 p., 85 pl. in separate case. Baltimore, 1943. The Waverly Press for the American Council of Learned Societies). \$6.00.

Now at last, and for the first time, we have a thoroughly documented account in English of one of the most important and accomplished works

of art remaining in the Far East—the wall paintings of the Kondo, the Golden Hall, at Horyuji Monastery in Nara, Japan. No other great series of religious paintings in the grand manner survives from that period with the possible exception of some grotto walls in China, and of those we have no such adequate description.

Today we can not be sure whether these paintings were made by Chinese masters invited to the Japanese capital in the train of continental abbots direct from China, or by way of the Korean Peninsula, or whether Koreans painted them, or if the Japanese apprentices had so early become masters of the great tradition which, two generations later, they enjoyed to the full.

The translators, Messrs. William Acker of the Freer Gallery and Benjamin Rowland of Harvard College, have rendered us greater service by their scholarly work on Mr. Naito's text than the casual reader is likely to guess. For out of the welter of fact, opinion, documented argument and repetitious restatement which direct translation seems always to yield from Japanese scholarship, these gentlemen have contrived an argument one is able to follow. The results of up-to-date native research are all there, together with such Buddhist texts and archaeological references as are needed.

The author's conclusion that the paintings may be dated in the years just prior to A.D. 711 is based on the well-known and persuasive arguments in which their style is compared to the Toindo Kwannon and the Yakushi bronze Trinity, presumed to have been made in A.D. 717-723. As to the vexing question whether or not the south panel of the east wall is contemporary with the others, in spite of its seemingly different style and the different chemical ingredients, Mr. Naito is somewhat less convincing in his argument that they are of the same date.

These questions, though of real interest, are of less significance than the question of how, after all, the ancients used the great human document which was at once a cathedral church for liturgy and prayer, a goal of pilgrimage, and a center for the new learning.

The key to the scriptures spread over these walls in picture form can be found only through a correct understanding of the identity of the gods in their various paradises and in the relative order in which they were placed. This key Mr. Naito has now definitely established when he traced the shapes of the Ten Great Disciples, obliterated since the Middle Ages, and showed that the south panel of the east wall has been mistakenly called a Hosho Paradise instead of Shaka's. That the northeast Heaven proves to be that of Yakushi is the less surprising because the Right Reverend Abbot Seiki, of Horyuji, never doubted it. But it adds to the tragic irony of Mr. Naito's short and harassed life when we hear from the translators that the infra-red photographs which disclosed the god's proper attributes were made only after his death. It is to be believed that Mr. Naito's soul, reborn from its lotus bud in the Sukhavati Lake (on the west

wall), may enjoy a certain grim satisfaction in knowing that his iconography has been justified. One would like, however, to consult his new found wisdom concerning the matter of the Bosatsu on the northwest panel of the same wall. For me it has always been Monju, to correspond with the Fugen at the other corner. After all, who ever heard of a Miroku and a Miroku Bosatsu side by side?

Some thirty pages of English text (and no doubt triple that number in Japanese) deal with the question of why the four Great Paradise scenes appear to violate the canonical positions, one by thirty-five degrees, one by fifty-five degrees, while the Amida Heaven is "almost correct." The problem is illustrated by a plan with red arrows. But the answer surely needs no such tentative and painstaking apology. The author, persecuted, dying and frustrated, lacking any generous recognition from the scholarly world, had few chances to quit his sick bed and actually to use that great map of the universe. Perforce he poured over the plans in his room, looking down on the drawings, while he should have made his deliberate rounds from one great Paradise to the next. For, cramped within a foursquare building, these Paradises are in truth the Circle of the Heavens, the round horizon rim of the *Mandala* and that fact is never forgotten by the worshipper. In Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Chinese, Japanese and English, one *circumambulates*, making the Sunwise Turn.

The Kondo is entered through the three big doors that take up the whole length of the south wall, except for a narrow panel at either end, unfit for the magnificent spread of a Paradise painting. The left turn—ritual for Christian as well as Buddhist—keeps the wall always at one's left shoulder and the circle's hub at one's right. First comes Amida's Western Paradise, stretching wide on its proper wall. Then, dead ahead due north of you, Miroku who waits. Your prayers said and genuflections made in front of him, you turn to head east where, as a matter of course, is Kakushi, though actually on that same north wall. Turning to face due south, inevitably next, comes Shaka. The worshipper has walked from the north to the south to find him, but the sick scholar, looking down on his plan in a Tokyo boarding house, was puzzled to find this last Paradise at the southern end of the east wall. To stop a pilgrim after making what he rightly calls his *rounds* and to explain that he had been the victim of a pious fraud would have made him stare. Each Paradise had been approached in proper order and from the proper direction. The compass in his head and the circuit of the Four Quarters could not lie. Even the fact that the south (the canonical) entrance had no walls for paintings left that were big enough for anything but a slender standing Bodhisattva would not interest that pilgrim. He had walked always according to instinct and to ritual and he had come on the holy things he looked for in the only conceivable order. Most convincing of all, he had gone out the self-same door wherein he went.

The format of the two volumes is far better than one would have dared

hope for in war time, for the half-tones are entirely adequate for study and, should further research be desired, all the objects represented are to be found illustrated elsewhere. Mrs. Eliot's line illustrations are beautifully drawn and calculated for their purpose, and the type is clear. It should be noted that, by a printer's error, the legends under the illustrations numbered thirty and thirty-two were interchanged.

LANGDON WARNER  
Harvard University

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*American Romantic Painting* by Edgar P. Richardson [*Twin Books, I*, Edited by Robert Freund], 50 p., 236 ill., published by E. Weyhe, New York, 1944. \$10.00.

*The Cubist Painters—Aesthetic Meditations* by Guillaume Appollinaire (Translation by Lionel Abel) [*The Documents of Modern Art*, edited by Robert Motherwell] 36 p., 22 ill., paper, published by Wittenborn, New York, 1944. \$1.75.

*The Development of Painting in Canada, 1665-1945* (Catalogue of an Exhibition by the Art Gallery of Toronto, The Art Association of Montreal, The National Gallery of Canada, and Le Musée de la Province de Québec), 65 p., 45 ill. (one in color), paper, bibliography, published by the Ryerson Press, Toronto (Bruce, Humphries, Inc., Boston), 1944. \$1.50.

*Burliuk* by Katherine S. Drier (Foreword by Duncan Phillips), xvi + 182 p., 53 ill., paper, published by the Société Anonyme and Color and Rhyme (Distributed by Wittenborn), New York, 1944. \$4.75.

*Hands and Their Construction* by Victor Perard, vii + 194 p. of drawings, published by the Pitman Publishing Corporation, New York and Chicago, 1944. \$3.50.

*Notes Hispanic*, vol. IV, 132 p., ill., paper, published by the Hispanic Society of America, New York, 1944. \$1.00.

*The Iliad of Homer* (A line-for-line translation in dactylic hexameters, by William B. Smith and Walter Miller), 565 p., 39 ill., (Flaxman's drawings), published by Macmillan, New York, 1944. \$3.75.

*The Last Flowering of the Middle Ages* by Joseph van der Elst, 127 p., 107 pl. (of which 15 in color), published by Doubleday, Doran, Garden City, N.Y. \$7.50.

*Were You There When They Crucified My Lord* by Allan Rohan Crite (Foreword by Kenneth John Conant), 40 drawings plus 39 end pieces, in illustrations of the spiritual, published by the Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1944. \$3.00.

*Yesterday's Children* by Pavel Tchelitchew and Parker Tyler, 30 drawings with poetic commentary, published by Harper's, New York, 1944. \$3.00.

study  
e to  
fully  
d be  
um-

y

t, I,  
New

aire  
by  
New

an  
eal,  
ec),  
son

82  
me

aw-  
nd

nic

rs,  
w-

p-  
en

ite  
in  
ss,

w-  
o.



## INDEX FOR VOLUME IV

- American Art Research Council and the Colleges*, by ALFRED H. BARR, JR., 39
- American Painting Before the Civil War*, by FREDERICK A. SWEET, 190
- Art History and the Study of American Civilization*, by DONALD DREW EGBERT, 182
- Artist's Reply, An*, by WILLIAM GROPPER, 137
- Artist-Teacher's Reply, An*, by ZOLTAN SEPESHY, 137
- BARNES, ALBERT C., *On the Education of Artists in Colleges*, 138
- BARR, ALFRED H., JR., *American Art Research Council and the Colleges, The*, 39
- The Study of American Art in Colleges: A Preface*, 179
- BARRY, IRIS, *Motion Pictures as a Field of Research*, 206
- Behrendt, Walter Curt, Obituary, by HUGH S. MORRISON, 221
- Blueprint for a Textbook on Art*, by S. MACDONALD WRIGHT, 144
- Book Reviews
- Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, *Russian Icons and Objects of Ecclesiastical and Decorative Arts from the Collection of George R. Hann (WOLFGANG BORN)*, 122
- Colgate, William, *Canadian Art, Its Origin and Development* (R. H. HUBBARD), 112
- Garwood, Darrell, *Artist in Iowa: A Life of Grant Wood* (FRANK J. ROOS, JR.), 239
- Goodwin, Philip L., *Brazil Builds. Architecture New and Old, 1652-1942* (WALTER CURT BEHRENDT), 174
- Grosz, George, *Drawings* (ULRICH MIDDENDORF), 169
- Hagen, Oskar, *Patterns and Principles of Spanish Art* (BERNARD C. HEYL), 63
- Hamlin, Talbot, *Greek Revival Architecture in America* (DIMITRIS TSELOS), 114
- Heyl, Bernard C., *New Bearings in Esthetics and Art Criticism—A Study in Semantics and Evaluation* (BRUNO BETTELHEIM), 61
- Klee, Paul, *Pedagogical Sketch Book*, and Grohmann, Will, *The Drawings of Paul Klee* (H. W. JANSON), 232
- Lafuente, Enrique, *Veldquez* (OSKAR HAGEN), 236
- Loran, Erle, *Cézanne's Composition: Analysis of His Form with Diagrams and Photographs of His Motifs* (DOUGLAS MACAGY), 229
- Lyonel Feininger-Marsden Hartley, a catalogue of an exhibition (JOHN FABIAN KIENITZ), 237
- Mendelsohn, Eric, *Three Lectures on Architecture* (WALTER CURT BEHRENDT), 175
- Priest, Alan, *Chinese Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (JOHN A. POPE), 118
- Richter, Gisela, M. A., *Kouroi, a Study of the Development of the Greek Kouros* (GEORGE E. MYLONAS), 120
- Schoen, Max, editor, *The Enjoyment of the Arts* (CARL THURSTON), 228
- Soby, James Thrall and Miller, Dorothy C., *Romantic Painting in America* (WALLACE SPENCER BALDINGER), 171
- Sweeney, James Johnson, *Alexander Calder* (H. W. JANSON), 64
- Twenty-second Annual of Advertising Art of the Art Directors Club; Art Directors 21st Annual of the Art Directors Club* (MILTON S. FOX), 59



24

*General  
Faxon*

- Toichiro, Naito, *The Wall Paintings of Horyuji* (LANGDON WARNER), 241  
Van Puyvelde, Leo, *Dutch Drawings in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle* (AGNES MONGAN), 116  
*Where the Two came to Their Father: A Navaho War Ceremonial*, given by Jeff King (A. IRVING HALLOWELL), 172  
BRENDL, OTTO, *Further Remarks on the Education of Artists in Colleges*, 141  
CAUMAN, SAMUEL, *The Science of Art History*, 23  
Committee of the College Art Association, *Statement on the Practice of Art Courses*, A, 33  
*Criticism and Journalase*, by WILLIAM RUSK SENER, 44  
*Education of Artists in Colleges*, On the, by ALBERT C. BARNES, 138  
EGBERT, DONALD DREW, *Art History and the Study of American Civilization*, 182  
*European Art Collections and the War*, by GLADYS E. HAMLIN, Part I, 155; Part II, 209  
*Further Remarks on the Education of Artists in Colleges*, by OTTO BRENDL, 141  
GIEDION, SIGFRIED, *The Practical Arts in American History*, 198  
Goldschmidt, Adolph, Obituary, by KURT WEITZMANN, 47  
GOODRICH, LLOYD, *Painting from the Civil War to the Present*, 194  
GROPPER, WILLIAM, *An Artist's Reply*, 137  
HAMLIN, GLADYS E., *European Art Collections and the War*, Part I, 155; Part II, 209  
HEYL, BERNARD C., Obituary of Thomas B. Jeffery, 106  
HOPE, HENRY R., Obituary of Heinz H. Thannhauser, 108  
HUNTLEY, G. HAYDN, *Notes on Victorian Art*, 127  
*Industrial Design as a Profession*, by J. GORDON LIPPINCOTT, 149  
JANSON, H. W., Letter to the Editor, 213  
*Jeffery, Thomas B.*, Obituary by BERNARD C. HEYL, 106  
KING, EDWARD S., Obituary of C. Morgan Marshall, 222  
LAPORTE, PAUL M., *Taking Moving Pictures of Works of Art*, 153  
LEHMANN, KARL, Obituary of Erling C. Olsen, 107  
Letters to the Editor, Charles De Tolnay, 55; Janson, H. W., 213; Lester D. Longman, 217; Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., 216; Lincoln Rothschild, 57  
LIPPINCOTT, J. GORDON, *Industrial Design as a Profession*, 149  
LONGMAN, LESTER D., *Why Not Educate Artists in Colleges?*, 132, Letter to the Editor, 217  
Marshall, C. Morgan, Obituary, by EDWARD S. KING, 222  
MATHER, FRANK JEWETT, JR., Letter to the Editor, 216  
MORRISON, HUGH S., Obituary of Walter Curt Behrendt, 221  
*Motion Pictures as a Field of Research*, by IRIS BARRY, 206  
*Need for Research in Photography*, The, by NANCY NEWHALL, 203  
*Notes on Victorian Art*, by G. HAYDN HUNTLEY, 127  
Obituaries, Adolph Goldschmidt, 47; Walter Haring, 50; Thomas B. Jeffery, 106; Erling C. Olsen, 107; Heinz H. Thannhauser, 108; C. Morgan Marshall, 222; Walter Curt Behrendt, 221  
Olsen, Erling C., An Obituary, by KARL LEHMANN, 107  
*Painting from the Civil War to the Present*, by LLOYD GOODRICH, 194  
*Practical Arts in American History*, The, by SIGFRIED GIEDION, 198  
*Research in American Architecture*, by FRANK J. ROOS, JR., 186  
ROOS, FRANK J., JR., *Research in American Architecture*, 186

- ROTHSCHILD, LINCOLN, Letter to the Editor, 57  
RUSK, WILLIAM SENER, *Criticism and Journalese*, 44  
*Science of Art History, The*, by SAMUEL GAUMAN, 23  
SEPESHY, ZOLTAN, *Artist-Teacher's Reply, An*, 137  
*Statement on the Practice of Art Courses, A*, by the Committee of the College  
Art Association, 33  
*Study of American Art in Colleges: A Preface, The*, by ALFRED H. BARR, JR., 179  
SWEET, FREDERICK A., *American Painting Before the Civil War*, 190  
*Taking Moving Pictures of Works of Art*, by PAUL M. LAPORTE, 153  
*Technique of Impressionism: A Reappraisal, The*, by J. CARSON WEBSTER, 3  
Thannhauser, Heinz H., Obituary by Henry R. Hope, 108  
TOLNAY, CHARLES DE, Letter to the Editor, 55  
WEBSTER, J. CARSON, *Technique of Impressionism: A Reappraisal, The*, 3  
WEITZMANN, KURT, Obituary of Adolph Goldschmidt, 47  
*Why Not Educate Artists in Colleges?* by LESTER D. LONGMAN, 132  
WRIGHT, S. MACDONALD, *Blueprint for a Textbook on Art*, 144

